

2 nd

3

6

BURROWS OF MICHIGAN
AND THE
REPUBLICAN PARTY
IN TWO VOLUMES
VOLUME I

BOOKS BY WILLIAM DANA ORCUTT

THE MOTH

THE SPELL

THE LEVER

THE BACHELORS

ROBERT CAVELIER

GOOD OLD DORCHESTER

THE PRINCESS KALLISTO

THE FLOWER OF DESTINY


THE WRITER'S DESK BOOK

THE AUTHOR'S DESK BOOK

THE MADONNA OF SACRIFICE

BURROWS OF MICHIGAN AND THE
REPUBLICAN PARTY. 2 vols.





J. C. Burman

BURROWS OF MICHIGAN

AND THE

REPUBLICAN PARTY

A BIOGRAPHY AND A HISTORY

BY

WILLIAM DANA ORCUTT

SENATOR JULIUS C. BURROWS

1911

VOLUME I



LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS

1917

NO. VIII



J. C. Bunn

BURROWS OF MICHIGAN
AND THE
REPUBLICAN PARTY
A BIOGRAPHY AND A HISTORY

BY
WILLIAM DANA ORCUTT

VOLUME I



LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS

1917

70 1111
1111111111

COPYRIGHT, 1917
BY LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

THE · PLIMPTON · PRESS
NORWOOD · MASS · U.S.A

To
BURROWS McNEIR
AND
THOMAS SHEPHERD McNEIR
THESE EPISODES IN PATRIOTISM
OF THEIR DISTINGUISHED GRANDFATHER
ARE DEDICATED

PREFACE

THE personality of many men is best found in their private correspondence. The real nature of an individual is disclosed not by his vocation, which may be the result of accident or environment, but by the use he makes of his leisure hours. These are his own, and what he does within this limitation may fairly be taken as an expression of his personal choice. To keep a diary is an evidence of introspection.

Senator Burrows was not a voluminous correspondent, preferring the more direct appeal of personal intercourse. During his long life of National service he realized that each speech he made, each measure upon which he voted, was a record of character which no man could escape; and he preferred to be judged by his public utterances and acts. He had no avocation, for his life was entirely absorbed by the direct and indirect duties incidental to the important work which his Party intrusted to him. He was not introspective, and his diary is written upon the pages of the *Congressional Record* and in the stenographers' reports of his public speeches.

This habit of life, while clearly consistent with the man, has both lightened and complicated the labors of his biographer. There have been fewer inconsistencies to reconcile, there has been less secret history to disclose. Senator Burrows lived in the open, fought his battles in public, and left to his biographer the pleasure of recording and analyzing rather than the task of explaining. This record covers so long a period and so many subjects vital to the evolutionary progress of the country, that to condense it even within the space of two volumes such as these has necessitated the utmost care in order to preserve the proportions without unduly affecting the true perspective.

From those who knew Senator Burrows in action and who worked with him, have come many sidelights which have been of infinite value to the biographer in drawing his pen picture of the man, and he acknowledges gratefully his obligations to ex-Vice-President Charles W. Fairbanks, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, ex-Speaker Joseph G. Cannon, and ex-Governor John T. Rich of Michigan; also to Dr. Davis R. Dewey, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for his critical reading in manuscript of the chapters on Protection and Currency. Henry M. Rose, Esquire, now assistant secretary of the United States Senate, and for many years Senator Burrows'

confidential secretary, has given generously of his time and knowledge. Edward C. Goodwin, Esquire, librarian of the United States Senate, and Mrs. Jennie P. Andrews, of the War Department, have lessened the research labors.

The writing of these volumes has not been a perfunctory literary task. The biographer has completed his work with an increased knowledge of the influences surrounding those who conscientiously labor for the advancement of their country's interests, and with a profound admiration for those few who have proved themselves strong enough to hold closely to their plotted course. He has learned also how great a debt the present owes to those of the past generation who built so firmly that basis upon which we must rest today if we are to endure as a Nation and stand as a World power.

WILLIAM DANA ORCUTT

BOSTON, *October*, 1917

CONTENTS TO VOLUME I

	PAGE
CHAPTER I	
Early Days. 1837-1862.....	3
CHAPTER II	
The Soldier Husband. 1862-1863.....	37
CHAPTER III	
The Soldier Husband. 1863-1864.....	77
CHAPTER IV	
Personal Reconstruction. 1864-1872.....	116
CHAPTER V	
In Congress and Out. 1873-1878.....	145
CHAPTER VI	
Back in Congress. 1879-1885.....	171
CHAPTER VII	
Later Years in the Lower House. 1885-1890....	208
CHAPTER VIII	
The Protectionist. 1885-1888.....	236
CHAPTER IX	
The McKinley Bill. 1890.....	264
CHAPTER X	
Reciprocity. 1889-1902.....	279
CHAPTER XI	
The Wilson Bill. 1894.....	307
CHAPTER XII	
Currency. 1874-1896.....	322

ILLUSTRATIONS TO VOLUME I

SENATOR JULIUS C. BURROWS, 1911.....	<i>Frontispiece</i>
MRS. MARIA B. SMITH BURROWS.....	<i>Facing page</i> 8
WILLIAM BURROWS.....	10
BOYHOOD HOME OF SENATOR BURROWS.....	12
MRS. JENNIE HIBBARD BURROWS, 1860	22
JULIUS C. BURROWS, 1855.....	26
JULIUS C. BURROWS, 1858	26
CAPTAIN BURROWS, 1862.....	38
REPRESENTATIVE BURROWS, 1872.....	144
THE NAST CARTOON ON BURROWS' SECURITY OF ELEC- TIONS SPEECH, 1875.....	158
THE GILLAM CARTOON ON CLEVELAND'S FREE TRADE MESSAGE, 1887.....	246
CARTOON — " <i>Michigan's St. George</i> "	304
CARTOON — " <i>A Memorable Knock-out</i> ".....	334
CARTOON — " <i>Some Hope for Silver</i> ".....	350

BURROWS OF MICHIGAN
AND THE
REPUBLICAN PARTY

BURROWS OF MICHIGAN AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

CHAPTER I

EARLY DAYS. 1837-1862

THE life history of Julius Cæsar Burrows is so closely interwoven with that of the Republican Party that the one can never be told without embracing the chief events of the other. From its earliest days down to 1912 he played some part, small or great, in nearly every important movement for which the Party stands accredited, and for thirty years he was one of its chief spokesmen in expounding its principles on the stump or in Congress. While never a leader in the same sense as was Blaine, Garfield, Reed, or McKinley, he ranked with these National characters in ability and statesmanship, and beyond them in his constructive usefulness to his Party.

“Under the oaks of Jackson,” said John Hay, in his famous Golden Anniversary oration, “the 6th of July, 1854, a Party was brought into being and baptized which ever since has answered the purpose

of its existence with fewer follies and failures and more magnificent achievements than ordinarily fall to the lot of any institution of mortal origin."

Burrows was in his eighteenth year when this historic event occurred,—a student in the Grand River Institute at Austinburg, Ashtabula County, Ohio. He had been born into an environment of outspoken devotion to the cause of freedom; he had been brought up on the diet of abolition, asking no greater entertainment than to listen to his father's impassioned discussions of the great political questions of the day; he had found ample opportunity to watch the great contests of Parties and to hear the debates between their leaders,—and the newly formed Republican Party included him among those zealous young men of the North who joined it heart and soul, pledging their very lives to the prevention of further encroachment of the principle of slavery. The promulgation of the new political creed and the birth of the new political organization seemed to young Burrows nothing less than a summons to a crusade of righteousness, into which he threw himself with the fiery impetuosity of youth, and with an intensity of unwavering devotion which abided with him throughout his long political career. "It was at that happy stage in the development of an institution," says Thayer, when "its ideals, unsullied yet

by selfish desires, justified the enthusiasm of its supporters. Its principles had the compulsion of religion; and rightly so, because they aimed at carrying out in the sphere of public life the behests of private conscience.”¹

We may not all agree with the theory that the Republican Party “has answered the purpose of its existence with fewer follies and failures and more magnificent achievements than ordinarily fall to the lot of any institution of mortal origin,” but no statement could better express the conviction which possessed Burrows from his earliest association with it. He was conscious of its weaknesses; but these he would have explained away as due to individual shortcomings rather than to Party error. To him the Republican Party as an institution could do no wrong. When influential members cast discredit upon it he regarded them as traitors to their country; for was it not the Republican Party which had preserved the Union, and which had repaired the one weak link in the chain forged by the founders of the Republic by abolishing the traffic in human flesh?

We ourselves are too far removed from the day when Burrows’ political convictions were irrevocably cast to appreciate how deeply the iron entered into the souls of men at that period. This generation

¹ *Thayer*: “The Life of John Hay,” volume I, page 82.

has fortunately never known and the past generation has been glad to forget the condition of actual hatred which then existed between the Republicans and the Southern Democrats and their Northern sympathizers. Parties in those days meant something more than a difference in opinion regarding Protection and Free Trade. The Republicans, direct successors of the old Whig Party, looked upon themselves as representatives of righteousness, and considered their opponents as agents of the Devil in their disloyalty to the Union, in their tenacious insistence that the institution of slavery was justifiable, and in their determination to disrupt the Republic if necessary to accomplish their purposes. The Democrats, on the other hand, refused to recognize the religious aspect of the cause espoused by the Republicans, and could see in their efforts to restrain and later to destroy an established institution nothing but unconstitutional aggression, and an affront to be resented and rebuked.

The birth of the Republican Party in 1854 crystallized the conflict between conscientiously formed but diametrically opposed judgments which had for years seethed within the breasts of thinking men, unsatisfied by the long era of compromise, and which when later brought to the surface could be settled only by the clash of arms. "The Republican Party,"

Hay said in the oration already quoted, "sprang directly from an aroused and indignant National conscience. Questions of finance, of political economy, of orderly administration, passed out of sight for the moment, to be taken up and dealt with later on; but in 1854 the question that brought the thinking men together was whether there should be a limit to the aggressions of slavery, and in 1861 that solemn inquiry turned to one still more portentous,—should the Nation live or die? The humblest old Republican in America has the right to be proud that in the days of his youth, in the presence of these momentous questions, he judged right, and if he is sleeping in his honored grave his children may justly be glad of his decision."

No doubt ever existed in Burrows' mind that his decision was rightly made. The disappointment he experienced in the fact that he was too young to vote for Frémont, the first Presidential candidate of the new Party, found expression in his active participation in the campaign, during which he made his earliest political speeches; and the defeat of his favorite only emphasized in his mind the necessity for further and greater effort to bring success to the ideals for which his Party stood. Four years later the Republicans nominated Lincoln as their standard-bearer. The ardor with which the young men of the

North threw themselves into this campaign has never been equaled, and contributed much to the successful outcome of the election. No one of these enthusiasts was more zealous than the youthful Burrows, who delivered impassioned speeches on the stump, and cast for Lincoln his earliest Presidential ballot. The election of the Republican candidate brought to Burrows the keenest satisfaction of his life; for his ideals had been realized, and that was the justification of his consecration. Within two years the young enthusiast found further opportunity to give tangible evidence of his loyalty and devotion, for he was among the first to offer himself in the defense of his country.

It is difficult for us who have learned the history of our Nation in the midst of comfort and safety to appreciate how deep-rooted become those lessons which are learned first-hand in the smoke of political controversy, or on the bloody battlefields of a civil war. It is easy for us, looking backwards, to criticise a Party which has from time to time been torn by internal corruption, and has indisputably erred in judgment: it is easy for us to question the sincerity of any man who stands by his Party through thick and thin for sixty years; but when one follows Burrows through these years of Party loyalty and discovers his unswerving integrity to principle, his constant fight against the individual betrayal of the high



MARIA B. SMITH BURROWS
Mother of Senator Burrows




ideals for which his Party stood at birth,—all doubt of sincerity vanishes, and one is forced to admiration not unmixed with wonder that so consistent and so straight a path as his could be preserved.

Julius Cæsar was the seventh son of William Burrows, a native of Connecticut, and Maria B. Smith, who came from Massachusetts. They moved to a farm at Busti, Chautauqua County, New York, soon after their marriage, and later to Grahamville, North East Township, Erie County, Pennsylvania, where the namesake of the famous Roman Emperor was born on January 9, 1837. His name was always a source of mortification to him, but it was an expression of his mother's fervid imagination,—an attribute which he inherited from her to a marked degree. The names of his six brothers and his one sister included Hannibal Hamilton, Jerome Bonaparte, Christopher Columbus, Sylvester Solomon, Adrian Addison, William Riley, and Almeda. Once, a good many years later, some one asked Senator Burrows if his father was a student of history.

"No," he answered; "but my mother was. I have detested 'highfaluting' names and titles all my life. I have invariably parted my hair on the side, and have been plain Mr. Burrows ever since coming to the Senate. It was a mistake to tag my brothers and me the way they did."

William Burrows, of Scotch-English descent, was a sturdy specimen of New England manhood, a pronounced Free-Soil Whig in politics and a "hard-shelled" Baptist in religion; but we may judge which conviction stood closer to his conscience when we learn that when his Church attempted to criticize his outspoken opposition to slavery, he promptly transferred his spiritual allegiance to another denomination. As the boys grew up, the anti-slavery question was the leading topic discussed in their hearing. At home, it was as regularly a part of the daily routine as the morning and evening prayers,—each one of the seven sons taking his turn at reading aloud from the latest New York *Tribune*, which was the breath craved by Father Burrows' nostrils. In place of the theater or the photoplay of today, the boys found their chief diversion in the debating societies, but as tolerated listeners only, and many a thrill was experienced from the heat of the debates between their excited fathers and elder brothers.

Father Burrows did not believe in higher education, but he neglected no opportunity for his sons to hear every great political speaker who came within driving distance of his home town, and for them to walk ten miles and back was no unusual occurrence. One gala day in the Burrows household was when Fred Douglass, the colored orator, arrived at Graham-



WILLIAM BURROWS
Father of Senator Burrows

ville in a buggy drawn by two horses, and became the honored guest of the family. Julius was broken-hearted when his father declared that he was too young to be taken to the lecture which Douglass delivered, but he drank in with wide-open eyes and bated breath the tales of slave life which the colored champion of his race related within his hearing. On the morning after the lecture, one of Douglas's horses broke loose, and with rare zeal the boy entered into the chase and capture, feeling that at last opportunity had been given him to make expression of the sympathy which until then he had kept silently within himself. By aiding Douglass, he felt that he had taken a definite step toward freeing the slaves, and he enjoyed to the full the consciousness of his early consecration.

Senator Burrows kept no diaries, but in twenty voluminous scrap-books he pasted clippings, letters, and memoranda from which the biographer has freely drawn. These memorabilia go back to 1860, and continue without a break down to the year of his death. From time to time Burrows refers to his boyhood life; and the following extracts, taken from interviews, letters, and anecdotes, when pieced together afford a picture of the period which is of value and interest beyond their personal association:

"I was born in a log-cabin," Burrows relates, "on

the side of a hill in Erie County, Pennsylvania. My father built a new house when I was a child which I thought to be remarkably commodious and elegant. When we moved into it with our belongings it seemed entirely too large and oppressively lonely. I went back to look at the old house several years ago, keeping its stately proportions in mind as I had always remembered them; but I could not find it. I saw a weather-beaten little hut of one and a half stories, with three rooms downstairs and an unfinished attic. I was distressed and amazed to learn that it was the imposing palace of my childhood.

“I think that my very earliest ambition was to be a preacher. When not more than five years old I recall distinctly my habit of getting the other children assembled on Sundays, or times when the old folks were gone away, fixing up a kind of pulpit of chairs and the wood-box, and then commanding strict attention while I recited some verses from the family Bible which I knew by heart.

“On one occasion three of us boys thought we would run away from home. The home-leaving was the bitterest time of my life. We went about a mile, and then realized we had no place to sleep and no food to eat. So we turned back and slept in the barn. When we came in to breakfast no one paid any attention to us,—there were so many of us that we had not



BOYHOOD HOME OF SENATOR
BURROWS

Erie County, Pennsylvania

been missed. We were chagrined not to be recognized as the heroes we felt ourselves to be. Finally Jerome, hoping to attract attention, assumed the attitude of the prodigal son, and said impressively, 'Well, mother, I see you still keep the old dog.'

"My six brothers and I worked on the farm, and attended the district school in Winter. I was always exhilarated and hopeful even in the sugar-bush, where, with a neck-yoke and two buckets over my shoulders, I followed my father and gathered maple sap from one tree to another. The cold wind whistled through the grove, and the mud, softened to an icy dough by the warmth of the water, clung in obstinate chunks to my cowhide boots; but I was full of joy notwithstanding. At night I would sleep a little, and then get up to stir the maple sap and to rub the kettle with fat pork to keep it from boiling over.

"The favorite pleasure resort of all the people in that region was a deep abyss which was called the 'gulf.' A very narrow path, made by the rains of many seasons and called the 'hogsback,' ran into the chasm. We boys used to play on the path at the risk of our limbs and lives, and to the distress of our parents. An eccentric character in the village of North East, not far away, announced that he would repair on a certain day to the 'hogsback' and die in

the presence of all those who cared to leave their work to witness the unusual event. He dug a grave near by, and made other necessary preparations for giving up the ghost. The man spent a busy and cheerful day on the 'hogsback.' Toward evening, however, he withdrew, saying that he was sorry to disappoint the crowd, but manifestly he had blundered in his arithmetic. My father had been a skeptic on the proposition right along, and wagered with my brother Jerome, who was optimist enough to risk his only sheep on the result.

"The performance on the 'hogsback' was one of the really great events of my boyhood. We talked about it for months, dating events upon it the same as if it had been a big wind or a killing frost. As an entertainment it beat the raising of a barn or a house, although on such an occasion there was much noisy joy throughout the day, and fist fights late in the afternoon.

"In the course of time my father sold his farm and moved to Grahamville,—a very little town in the same county. We now lived in a house which consisted of a large main building, and two decidedly gorgeous wings. My father had a tract of timber in which his seven sons regaled themselves with axes when serious work was slack. He also had an interest in a tannery. He was a pushing and thrifty man,

feeling his own need of an education and wanting his own sons to go to school."

In 1844, during the Clay-Polk campaign, when Julius was seven years old, a mass meeting of Whigs was announced to be held at Erie, at which the great Daniel Webster would be the principal speaker. As in the "log cabin and hard cider" campaign of 1840, this was a period of great popular excitement and elaborate political demonstrations. Like many other Whig farmers, Father Burrows harnessed up his great hay-wagon, with planks on either side to seat his boys and his neighbors, and the little Julius, to his intense joy, was permitted to go. In the center of the wagon was a cross-piece which supported a pole, and on this was perched a live raccoon. The wagon, decorated with flags and streamers and drawn by four horses, started at three o'clock in the morning for Erie, thirty miles distant. A neighbor's wagon was drawn by forty yoke of oxen. "I can see them yet," Burrows relates, "switching their long tails, leaning away from their yokes, and walking pigeon-toed."

As the great procession of wagons approached Erie by all converging roads the enthusiasm grew in intensity. The Burrows' wagon and other vehicles stopped in front of the tavern, where Julius joined his elder brother "Rome" in singing a Whig satirical song of the day, one verse of which was as follows:

*"Oh, Jimmy Polk is a man of doubt,
He wires in and he wires out;
You cannot tell when on his track
Whether he is going South or coming back."*

The proprietor of the tavern, an irate Democrat, rushed out, highly indignant over what he accepted as a personal affront, and threatened to shoot the entire Whig crowd, which by this time had joined the boys in singing the objectionable verses. The size of the party, however, overawed him, and he retired ungracefully, muttering anathemas while the crowd sang the louder.

The great meeting was held in the open air in a fifty-acre lot, and the famous Webster, with his cavernous eyes and deep, bass voice, electrified the throng with his eloquent views on Tariff, Currency, and other issues of the day. Such gatherings, and such enthusiasm and personal worship, are now memories of the past, and can never be repeated in this age of newspapers and publicity, which repeats to the world the eloquent sentiments of the orator almost before they are delivered.

This was the only time Burrows ever saw Webster, yet, young as he was, the experience made a lasting impression upon him. "All I can remember," he relates, "is that he was a very swarthy man and that he made a speech." The early ambition to

become a preacher changed at this point to an absolute determination to make himself a public speaker, and to enter public life. The extemporary pulpit of chairs and wood-box was metamorphosed into a rostrum, from which he now addressed his youthful audiences upon political subjects instead of the spiritual themes which had previously been his wont; and he modeled his delivery as closely upon that of Webster as a seven-year-old boy could.

So the child developed into the boy-man at an age when most children are still playing with their toys; his mind centered upon the big things of life rather than upon trivialities. The evolution had been wisely guided at the beginning by a father who himself took life seriously, and who taught his children their greatest lesson by the example he set them of devotion to a cause and sincerity of purpose in living up to every obligation imposed by the principles involved. The later influences under which Julius came could not have fitted more accurately into Father Burrows' scheme had he been permitted to control them, and the response made by the boy, then later by the man, gave evidence of his natural tendency toward the work to which he devoted his life.

Of the other sons, two also responded to the early influences by going into politics, but to a lesser degree than their more famous brother. Jerome Bonaparte

Burrows became a distinguished lawyer, and later a judge of the supreme court of Ohio. He was a resident of Painesville, Lake County, Ohio, which township adjoins Mentor, where was the home of James A. Garfield, and between these two men there existed the most intense political rivalry, both being candidates for Congress from the famous "Nineteenth District." Many thought Jerome Burrows had the better chance of election, but his previous persistent and successful efforts to secure an acquittal of a client in a long-celebrated case cost him the support of Ash-tabula County, and Garfield was elected. Had Jerome Burrows won in this seemingly local contest, it would have changed the history of the United States, as Garfield would probably have been unknown beyond the limits of his own State.

Sylvester Solomon Burrows became a practicing physician, but he possessed many of the attributes which make a statesman. He lived in Geneva, Ash-tabula County, Ohio, which is about fifteen miles east of Painesville. For some years he served his constituents as a member of the State senate, where he made a reputation as a debater, and demonstrated a ready understanding of parliamentary law and usage. Dr. Burrows was a man who always had the courage of his convictions, and, with him, as with Jerome, policy was a matter of secondary consideration.

Although an ardent Republican, unlike his brothers Dr. Burrows embraced the doctrine of Free Silver. When the Republican Committee of Ohio summoned Senator Burrows into the State to speak in behalf of Bushnell and Hanna, the Senator found his brother making Free Silver speeches of the most rabid nature. Whenever Julius made a "Sound Money" speech, his brother followed the next day, contesting every point. The Saturday night before election Senator Burrows addressed a monster Republican meeting in Music Hall, Cleveland. Dr. Burrows announced through the press that on Monday evening, in the same place, he would reply to his brother. Music Hall was packed, and the Doctor's audience thoroughly enjoyed the good-natured but energetic attack upon the Senator's basic principles. But whatever political differences might exist, there was always the warmest fraternal feeling between all the brothers; for the Burrowses were clannish. For many years there was an annual reunion of the brothers at Jerome's home, and the occasion was always one of rare pleasure for those friends who were fortunate enough to be included.

In 1850 Father Burrows and his family removed to another farm near Kingsville, Ashtabula County, Ohio,—but let us listen to the story as Burrows himself tells it: "We left Grahamville and bought a

farm in the famous Nineteenth District of Ohio, which was represented in Congress by Joshua R. Giddings, and, at a later date, by James A. Garfield, and which was also the home of Senator Benjamin F. Wade, the furious abolitionist. Money was scarce, markets were few and far apart, farm products had to be traded to merchants for calico and other goods. I received a little money by peeling apples and drying them in the sun. I milked five cows twice a day, and walked three miles to the Academy at Kingsville. In Winter I did chores at a man's house for my board, but I secured a room at the Academy, sweeping the building and ringing the bell for my tuition. My mother gave me a bed and a box-stove, and I did my own cooking. My food came from the farm, and was prepared on the stove in my room by frying the pork on the top and roasting the potatoes in the ashes; but occasionally I went home, four miles away, for a square meal.

“On Wednesdays we had rhetorical. A teacher named Drake seemed to take pleasure in criticising and humiliating me before my fellow-students. One day I opened on Drake in an outrageous speech. He ordered me off the platform, following the command, when I didn't go, with a push. The girls screamed and the boys laughed. Then I went outside and finished my speech on the fence.”

There are still living several who remember the old days in Kingsville Academy. Norris L. Gage, of Ashtabula, Ohio, in a letter to his brother Stephen, who was a student there at the same time as the Burrows boys, writes of this period:

"I persuaded my mother to allow me to attend the exhibition which took place in the Baptist Church at the close of the Fall term at Kingsville Academy. I had no shoes, but that mattered not, as boys of nine or ten years were not expected to wear shoes until snow commenced to fly in November. The fact that I had no coat I knew was a substantial drawback, but I had a sort of calico vest, and my mother had carefully prepared a clean white shirt which, with linen trousers and a cap, completed my outfit for the occasion. When ready to start I was much astonished, on looking down at myself, to see what a white and ghostlike appearance I presented. My mother, however, encouraged me by saying that if I behaved as well as I looked all would be well, and I started with a light heart and nimble feet.

"I remember one incident of a startling nature. It seems that as a climax one of the Burrows boys, either 'Rome' or Julius Cæsar, was to declaim a piece called 'The Maniac.' He had stationed himself in the hall, and when his name was called he jumped and struck the open door with fists and feet, making a great

clatter and outcry, and then strode up the aisle towards the rostrum, both hands clutched in his own dishevelled hair, a look of agony on his face, screaming at the top of his voice, 'I am not mad, I am not mad,' finishing his recitation in the same tragic manner. It was deemed a great piece of oratory."

After his experience at Kingsville, Burrows attended the academy at Austinburg, in the same county, teaching school during the Winter months, as did also his sister and five of his brothers. By the time he was eighteen years old he was regarded as a competent pedagogue, and was appointed principal of a "female" seminary in Madison, Lake County, Ohio. It was here that the romance of his life occurred, for the assistant principal was Miss Jennie S. Hibbard, to whom he was married within a few months, on January 31, 1856, just after passing his nineteenth birthday. The letter written by the youthful and admiring assistant principal to announce to her uncle her engagement is so charmingly *naïve* that it is given here in full:

From Miss Jennie S. Hibbard

MADISON SEM., November, 19th, '55

VERY DEAR UNCLE:

Here I am pleasantly located in the flourishing town of Madison, surrounded by all the pleasures life



MRS. JULIUS C. BURROWS

Jennie S. Hibbard

1860

would seek. You may wish to know why I am here and what I am engaged in (perhaps the question would be full as easily answered were you to ask *who* I am engaged *to*—however, we will let that pass for the present). The circular within may partially furnish you with an answer. Suffice it to add that we have a *very exceedingly* pleasant school. This is the first week of our second term—eleven weeks each. Mr. J. C. Burrows, you will see by the advertisement, is principal, and Miss Jennie S. Hibbard his assistant.

He is a gentleman eighteen years of age, irreproachable character, generous impulses, and endowed with a giant intellect which threatens some future day to make the world *tremble*. There's a certain honorable *nobility* about him that serves at once as a passport to the best of society. He is at once distinguished from the common mind—a gentleman from Geneva where he resides says he is the most talented man in America; so you see, Uncle, I am not the only one that admires his character. Mayhaps you may think that my regard for him amounts to something more than admiration, and indeed, dear Uncle, can you present any good reason why it should not? We board at the same place and have a common sitting-room, consequently I am thrown into his company continually. Thereby I have ample opportunity of noting the various passions which actuate him, and

I can say truthfully that I have never known him to do aught but was honorable and praiseworthy. He is at present engaged at the same table with myself writing an original speech, which he anticipates delivering before long at Centerville in the townhouse. You may well think I am proud of the conquest I have gained, and I will nobly strive to fill with honor the important station I am about to occupy.

I often think how Aunt Sarah almost blamed me because I refused the addresses of a certain young man—the first letters of his name are C—— A——. He has since married M—— H——, and is no more to be compared with your *prospective nephew* than a soap-bubble to the foaming waters of Niagara. Mr. Burrows is at times mirthful, but again the Goddess of Thought holds sway over him, proud of her high mission. He will probably teach here one term more, and then will commence reading law. A life of usefulness is predicted by all. He has one brother reading law now at Cleveland, another at Hamilton College preparing for the ministry, another a practicing physician at Lenox—quite a literary family methinks I hear you say, and indeed they are; and now, Uncle, if I wasn't afraid I should blush (right before him, too) I would tell you that I am about to launch off into the peculiar state of connubial bliss with this mighty genius, and then I would not only ask but implore

of you and Aunties to come and help celebrate the nuptials; but you know I am an extremely bashful child, therefore you must take the will for the deed, and imagine what delicacy forbids me to write.

Now, Uncle, if you love me or regard my most ardent wishes, do arrange your business so as to be at our house January 31st., 9 o'clock A. M., and I am not willing that any should arrange my bridal array save Aunts Mary and Sally. Oh, you will come, won't you? *All* of you. Come at least a week before the great event transpires. I know you never will regret it. If you knew how much it would conduce to my happiness I know you wouldn't refuse me this one request. Please write soon and let me know your decision, but *please don't* say *no*; and now, Aunt Sally, I am about to ask a great favor of you. Will you grant it? You know there are no dressy or tasty milliners around here, none that I would trust to make a bridal hat. Your skill and ingenuity combined with Aunt Mary's excellent taste alone can please my fancy. Is the boon too great to ask? The favor is a great one I know, and yet I know if it is consistent with your previous arrangements you will make it for me, but, Auntie, you will only half fulfill the request unless you come and bring it. Should cruel fate detain you perhaps you might send it. Please make it so by a little changing I could wear it next Summer.

Please let me know soon if you can make it; if not I shall have to go to Painesville or Cleveland.

From JENNIE who will *never* forget you.

If you do not *all* come I shall surely cry my eyes all out, and then how I'd look (and a bride too).

Post Script 1st. I can't send this till I go home, for I have forgotten the name of the town you reside in.

P.S. 2nd. Pa is in Buffalo, but will be at home about the 31st of January.

P.S. 3rd. Our people made me the little present of a gold watch, and chain, a few weeks since. Cost $78\frac{1}{2}$ dollars.

P.S. 4th. Mr. Burrows sends his compliments.

P.S. 5th. If you cannot decipher this scribbling you had better come right down, for you don't know but that it contains very important news.

P.S. 6th. Guess I've told all I know, at least can't think of anything else to say, only I love you all prodigiously,

Your JENNIE

Few men have had thrust upon them the necessity of living up to a picture such as is here drawn, but a perusal of the war letters in a later chapter will show how well the youthful husband succeeded. Their brief married life was filled with the anxiety and the



*As principal of the Madison, Ohio,
Seminary*
1855



*As principal of the Union School,
Jefferson, Ohio*
1858

EARLY PORTRAITS OF SENATOR BURROWS

pain of separation incidental to the Civil War period, but Burrows was ever her "giant intellect" and her "mighty genius." Never did she doubt his ability "to make the world tremble."

After leaving Madison, in the Fall of 1858 Burrows took charge of the Union School at Jefferson, Ashtabula County, Ohio, as principal. While here he found his recreation outside of school hours playing "rounders" with Congressman Joshua R. Giddings, a game which was subsequently developed into our National pastime of baseball, and also by studying law in the office of Cadwell & Simonds, where he finished his legal studies, and a year later was admitted to the bar.

Jefferson, like Kingsville, was in the midst of the famous old Nineteenth Congressional District of Ohio, a district which has produced more distinguished public men than any similar area in America. In his school Burrows had as pupils the children of Giddings and of Senator Benjamin F. Wade, and also the sisters and brothers of William Dean Howells, the dean of American letters. Howells, indeed, has made Jefferson immortal in his essay on *The Country Printer*. It was in this town that Howells' father established a Whig newspaper, and Howells' early memories of those days, which were contemporaneous with the period in which Burrows

lived in Jefferson, give a charming picture of the place and of the people:

“The county-seat,” he writes, “was a village of only six or seven hundred inhabitants. But, as the United States Senator ¹ who was one of its citizens used to say, it was ‘a place of great political privileges.’ The dauntless man ² who represented the district in the House for twenty years, and who had fought the anti-slavery battle from the first, was his fellow-villager, and more than compeer in distinction; and, besides these, there was nearly always a State senator or representative among us. The county officers, of course, lived at the county-seat, and the leading lawyers, who were the leading politicians, made their homes in the shadow of the court-house, where one of them was presently elected to preside as Judge of the Common Pleas. In politics, the county was already overwhelmingly Free-Soil, as the forerunner of the Republican Party was then called; the Whigs had hardly gathered themselves together since the defeat of General Scott for the Presidency; the Democrats, though dominant in State and Nation, and faithful to slavery at every election, did not greatly outnumber among us the zealots called Come-outers, who would not vote at all under a constitution recognizing the right of men to own men. . . .

¹ Benjamin F. Wade.

² Joshua R. Giddings.

“The people of the county were mostly farmers, and of these nearly all were dairy men. The few manufactures were on a small scale, except perhaps the making of oars, which were shipped all over the world from the heart of the primeval forests densely wooding the vast levels of the region. The portable steam saw-mills dropped down on the borders of the woods have long since eaten their way through and through them, and devoured every stick of timber in most places, and drunk up the water-courses that the woods once kept full; but at that time half the land was in the shadow of those mighty poplars and hickories, elms and chestnuts, ashes and hemlocks; and the meadows that pastured the herds of red cattle were dotted with stumps as thick as harvest stubble. Now . . . there is more money in the hands of the farmers there, though there is still so little that by any city scale it would seem comically little, pathetically little; but forty years ago there was so much less that fifty dollars seldom passed through a farmer’s hands in a year. Payment was made in kind rather than in coin, and every sort of farm produce was legal tender at the printing-office. Wood was welcome in any quantity, for the huge box-stove consumed it with inappeasable voracity. . . . Perhaps this was not so much the fault of the stove as of the building. In that cold, lake-shore country the

people dwelt in wooden structures almost as thin and flimsy as tents. . . .

“Our county was the most characteristic of that remarkable group of counties in northern Ohio called the Western Reserve, and forty years ago the population was almost purely New England in origin, either by direct settlement from Connecticut, or indirectly after the sojourn of a generation in New York State. We were ourselves from southern Ohio, where the life was then strongly tinged by the adjoining life of Kentucky and Virginia, and we found these transplanted Yankees cold and blunt in their manners; but we did not undervalue their virtues. They formed in that day a leaven of right thinking and feeling which was to leaven the whole lump of the otherwise pro-slavery or indifferent State; and I suppose that outside of the anti-slavery circles of Boston there was nowhere in the country a population so resolute and so intelligent in its political opinions. They were very radical in every way, and hospitable to novelty of all kinds. I imagine that they tested more new religions and new patents than have been even heard of in less inquiring communities. When we came among them they had lately been swept by the fires of spiritualism, which left behind a great deal of smoke and ashes where the inherited New England orthodoxy had been. . . . The old New York *Trib-*

une, which was circulated in the county almost as widely as our own paper, had deeply schooled the people in the economics of Horace Greeley, and they were ready for any sort of millennium, religious or industrial, that should arrive, while they looked very wisely after the main chance in the meantime. They were temperate, hard-working, hard-thinking folks, who dwelt on their scattered farms, and came up to the county fair once a year.”¹

The period at Jefferson, though not extended, was of vital importance to Burrows. The companionship with Giddings and the discussions with Wade broadened his horizon, for their life in Washington gave them knowledge of and experience in National affairs which they brought home and disseminated among those whose limits were restricted. The arguments the boy had learned by heart from his father had been worn threadbare long since, but in his contact with these men who knew the world so much better he found that the principles he had assimilated were the same. The community in which he settled was composed of men, as Howells says, “of right thinking and feeling,” “resolute and intelligent in their political opinions.” As the mentor of their children, Burrows was forced to crystallize and express in definite form the conclusions he had reached, and all this tended to

¹ *Howells*: “Impressions and Experiences,” pp. 5-18.

set his ideas in a mold at a time in his life when convictions struck deep.

Here at Jefferson, Ohio, his daughter ¹ was born, and here he had his first taste of real home life; but a broader field opened for him in an opportunity to take charge of what was then known as the Prairie Seminary at Richland, in Kalamazoo County, Michigan. Thither he took his little family in 1859, "by rail to Three Rivers, by stage to Kalamazoo, and by foot to Richland." This marked his entrance into the State whose history he was to affect, and whose representative he was to be in Washington for a period equaled by few men in the annals of the country.

Of his work at Richland, Burrows makes this comment: "I was a stranger, and that is probably why I was successful. I was engaged to teach all the branches, but some I had never even studied. That year was a delightful one. I did not have a single rule in the school. I simply tried to teach the scholars to do something and to be something."

As the personal development progressed, Burrows found the profession of teaching more and more irksome. He could never be contented to show others how "to do something and to be something"; he him-

¹ Meda Burrows, Senator Burrows' only child, married George McNeir, Esquire, of New York, on October 16, 1881. Her two sons are Burrows McNeir and Thomas Shepherd McNeir.

self must be the doer. With his admission to the bar he saw his opportunity to place himself nearer to the center of things, and in the Fall of 1861 he cut himself loose from the restraint of the schoolroom, moving to Kalamazoo and entering upon the practice of law. He felt stirring within him the desire to express those ideals of the new Republican Party; he had taken part in two Presidential campaigns, and had seen Lincoln elected; he sensed the meaning of this first success of the new political organization, and knew that as an expounder of the law he could advance its principles with greater effectiveness.

Like all young lawyers, Burrows experienced a hard struggle at the beginning of his career, and he used to boast that his books showed an income of a dollar and a half for the first three months' business. Still the fact remains that he quickly made himself felt in his profession, and won an enviable reputation as a jury lawyer, where his oratorical powers made themselves felt. That he was well-grounded in the general principles of law is evident in all his important speeches in Congress, and during the brief breaks in his public life, when he returned to his practice, his services were always in demand.

In his law practice, Burrows first associated himself with A. A. Knappen, and between these two men there developed a deep personal friendship which

lasted throughout their lifetime. Knappen was an older man, but was in full sympathy with the enthusiasm of his youthful partner, encouraging him in his ambitions and coöperating with him in his patriotic services. During Burrows' absence at the front several interesting letters passed between them, evidencing mutual affection and admiration.¹

Burrows was not permitted long to continue in the work of his profession. The time was close at hand when men's thoughts were forced to turn in directions other than those of peaceful pursuits, professional or otherwise. The people of the North had not grasped, as those of the South clearly had, the significance of Lincoln's election of 1860; for they could not believe it possible that any actual conflict in arms could take place between themselves and their own brothers in birth. Even when South Carolina held her Legislature in session until the news could be received as to the majority in the electoral college, and before adjournment, when it became known that Lincoln was elected, promptly provided for the purchase of

¹ On December 15, 1862, Knappen writes him: "Yours of the 7th inst. was received yesterday, and you may rest assured that it was perused with eager interest. I really believe the more of them I receive the more I prize them, and it is not strange,—a friendship such as ours to be committed to paper! You cannot make them too long. The only reason I do not write more is that I am ashamed of them in comparison with yours. . . . Now let me close this by repeating what I have so often said to you: Don't be rash, but only brave,—you cannot *improve* your reputation for fighting."

arms, the North still refused to believe that any crisis was at hand. When South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas formally declared themselves separated from the Union, many intelligent Northern men questioned in their own minds whether any one could legally dispute their action. The Southern States assumed that inasmuch as each one had entered the Union of its own free will, and might at that time have declined to become a member of it, it was unquestionably within their rights to withdraw, as from any other partnership, when cause for such withdrawal appeared to exist. When South Carolina sent commissioners to Washington to arrange, as a matter of course, for a proper division of the National debt, and for the formal transferal of all National property lying within her borders, President Buchanan was at a loss to know how to meet the situation. A peace conference was called to discuss and to arrange such problems as arose in connection with the breaking away of these States from their sister members of the Union, and no one seemed to know where the line could properly be drawn. Before the Federal authorities could come to any conclusion, the Confederacy had taken possession of every fortified position in the South except Fortress Monroe, Fort Sumter, Fort Pickens, and the Key West fortifications. Pres-

ident Buchanan's advisers were equally at sea. Some contended that the Southern States had a perfect right to act as they were acting, while others denied this right, but could formulate no action to check it. Under these circumstances they calmly stood aside, and waited to see what the new Republican Party, successful now for the first time, could accomplish.

CHAPTER II

THE SOLDIER-HUSBAND. 1862-1863

NO chapter in Burrows' life is more illuminating from the standpoint of character study than that which includes his mental attitude and physical action during the stirring period of the Civil War. The formation of the Republican Party in 1854, to which allusion has already been made, the struggle over Kansas, the attack made in the Senate Chamber by Brooks upon Sumner, the Dred Scott decision, the John Brown raid, the wranglings in the Thirty-fourth, the Thirty-fifth, and the Thirty-sixth Congresses,—all were landmarks of cumulative importance as the partisans of slavery and anti-slavery grew farther and farther apart, reaching a climax in the Republican nomination of Lincoln for President. For the first time the two factions were squarely pitted against each other, and the long-smouldering mass received the spark which turned it into a conflagration.

Burrows could see no compromise. Slavery was the one blot upon his country, slavery threatened the very life of the Republic, and those who favored it

were traitors. The lessons learned at his father's knee, the influence of the visit to his home of Fred Douglass, the arguments he had heard at the meetings of the debating-societies, the discussions at Jefferson with Giddings and Wade, combined to make him look upon his enrolment in the newly-formed Republican Party as a responsibility which could not be lightly considered. His duty lay not only in his expression of his opinion at the polls, but also in making use of his power as a speaker, even as a youth, in stimulating others to his own high pitch of enthusiasm.

Fort Sumter was fired upon on April 12, 1861, and three days later President Lincoln called by proclamation for seventy-five thousand volunteers. Burrows was inflamed with patriotism, and would have enlisted at once except for pressure brought to bear upon him by influential friends who urged him to make use of his natural gifts to arouse and maintain a similar degree of patriotic fervor among his townsmen. His law practice was forgotten, Blackstone gave way to tactics of war, and clients were turned into recruits. This service was recognized by Governor Austin Blair by issuing a commission to Burrows as Captain of Company D, Seventeenth Michigan Infantry, under date of June 17, 1862. This regiment had been organized in Detroit in the Spring of 1862 with an enrolment of 982 officers and men,



CAPTAIN BURROWS (1862)
Ætat 25

under the command of Colonel William H. Withington of Jackson.

With the signing of his commission Burrows saw no legitimate excuse for postponing the forward movement of his regiment. Patience has never been a characteristic of youth, and although a captain Burrows was still a boy. Patriots older than he chafed at the seeming deliberation with which the President and his Cabinet met the crises, and became disheartened by the delays and excuses made by McClellan, which gave the Southern army opportunity to augment its strength and to gain prestige by its early successes. Burrows fairly fumed over the "unwarranted delays" and the restraint they imposed, until at last he burst forth in a burning letter to a local Kalamazoo paper. It is youthful in expression and grandiloquent in style, but it displays the boy's temper, and pictures the sentiment of the period:

"When this direful rebellion first showed its hideous front, and commenced its war of murder and rapine," he wrote, "the loyal people, responding magnanimously to the call of the President, were told that this rebellion should be put down by the strong arm of the Government, and that in a few months peace would smile upon our country. Stimulated by that promise, and urged forward by an undying love for our institutions, our men of wealth poured

forth their treasures, and many a home took from the chain of its circle the golden link, and placed it with tears upon its country's altar. The people, confiding in their rulers, have not lagged in their duty, but life and treasure have been at the command of the Government. All that the people could do has been done willingly, and with an energy and earnestness unequaled in the history of the past. Almost by magic a mighty army sprang into existence, and with uplifted arms stood ready to smite the despoiler to the earth. But the blow was arrested. The people were wisely told that the troops must be drilled, and that the weather was too warm to venture on a Southern campaign; and that until the weather should be more favorable, traitors must rule.

“How the hard Northern cheek tingled with shame and indignation at the thought that homes must be plundered, loyal American citizens insulted and murdered, and our flag, the idol of the heart, torn and trailed in the dust, simply because the weather was not suited to the taste of ‘red tape’! Yet the people endured and obeyed the high mandate, and were still cheered with the promise that when that propitious time should arrive the blow would be struck. Then all minds were directed to the coming Fall as the probable time when the army would move. The heart was filled with new life, and the people almost

forgot their chagrin in the labors for the coming conflict. To the honest soldier it seemed as if Nature herself had forgotten to move, his heart throbbed so impatiently for the eventful hour when traitors should have dealt out to them the punishment they richly merit.

“Autumn came, and the people were coolly told that Winter was the proper time for the marching of our armies, and until then we must be content to fortify and drill. Again the people were utterly confounded, and lost all confidence in those they had trusted. The nations of the whole world were deriding our timidity, and threatening us with destruction if we did not show ourselves worthy of the title we bore. Yet all to no avail,—the army must drill! Winter comes, and lo! and behold! this is not a favorable time, and the army must go into Winter quarters! The roads are good, the soldiers are impatient, the people are ready, but the Government at Washington says, ‘Not yet.’ Winter is half spent, and the mighty army of two hundred thousand men on the Potomac is patiently resting in Winter quarters. Now what will these shoulder-strap gentlemen—what can the Executive say? When will they tell us that the time for fighting has come? Will it be in the Spring, when the roads are impassable, and disease and death are thinning our ranks? Will it be when the Nation

is stripped of its wealth, and has given its all to no effect? Will it be when the people are disheartened and exhausted and are willing to submit to anything for peace? Or will those in authority let the soldiers strike—cease to fatten upon the wealth of the people, and ‘let slip the dogs of war, that this foul deed may smell above the earth with carrion men groaning for burial’?

“When we shall get through making big men, when we shall cease our grand reviews and begin our grand march, when our Government has the manliness and courage to look traitors in the face and say, ‘So far and no farther,’ when it gets through patting treason and licking the feet of traitors, when the Government dares speak in our Congress, in our Executive, in his Cabinet, not by wordy proclamations but by law and bullets, then, and not till then shall we be victorious.”

Lincoln’s long-suffering patience was incomprehensible to Burrows, as it was to others. Later, the youthful patriot was to understand that the great-hearted President was willing to endure insult and mockery if by so doing he might prevent the necessity of continuing the fratricidal conflict. To him, the “rebels” were never traitors, but rather misguided, rebellious members of that great family over which he ruled as head, and he tried to win them back by

acts of mercy and conciliation. Burrows came to realize this later, and his splendid Eulogy of Lincoln, spoken on June 1, 1865, shortly after the President's assassination, is interesting not only for the changed attitude but also for the dignity in style which was indicative of the personal development three years had wrought. Seldom has a man so promptly and so completely answered his own criticism:

"While the ship of State was rocking upon rebellion's angry sea," he said, "Lincoln added no breath to the storm, but his words of sober counsel fell like oil upon the troubled waters. Every loyal heart in the whole country, in its mad impatience, demanded daring measures and proclamations that should have the ring of an Andrew Jackson in them; but while this policy might have received the approval of us all, yet it is equally probable that it would have been productive of but little good, and might have proven an act of National suicide. A breath of hasty passion from the Executive head would have swept the whole line of border States into the whirlpool of rebellion, and nursed the spirit of Northern opposition into formidable proportions. But with what wisdom and calmness, as he stood upon the banks of the Ohio, he addressed Kentuckians, then vacillating between loyalty and treason, repeating to them what he had uttered upon a former occasion. 'We mean to treat

you as near as we possibly can as Washington, Jefferson, and Madison treated you. We mean to leave you alone, and in no way to interfere with your institutions; to abide by all and every compromise of the Constitution; and, in a word, to treat you according to the example of those noble fathers. We mean to remember that you are as good as we,—that there is no difference between us other than the difference of circumstances. Fellow-citizens of Kentucky! friends! brethren may I call you in my new position? I see no occasion and feel no inclination to retract a word of this. If it shall not be made good, be assured the fault shall not be mine.’ ”

On August 8, 1862, the heartbreaking delay came to an end, the Seventeenth Michigan was mustered into service, and on August 27 it started for Washington. Here it was assigned to the First Brigade, First Division, Ninth Army Corps. In a letter written from camp at Waterford, Virginia, Burrows describes their first experiences:

“Our trip to Washington was a perfect ovation,” he wrote. “The people everywhere cheered us onward and bade us ‘Godspeed.’ After arriving at the city of Washington, and marching through some of the principal streets, we pitched our tents upon a hill near Fort Baker, and named the camp ‘Camp Willcox’ in honor of that noble son of Michigan who

on the field and in the prison is the same undaunted hero. While here in camp we spent our time in learning the use of the axe and spade in obedience to that mysterious strategy 'whose ways are past finding out.' "

Yet, in spite of this apparent delay, which caused Burrows to strain at the leash, it was only a little more than two weeks from the day the regiment left its State before it found itself in the midst of one of the severest battles of the war, taking into consideration the numbers engaged. Few regiments received so severe a test of their courage and soldierly qualities so soon after arriving in the field. On September 14 the Seventeenth, with the Ninth Corps, engaged the enemy at South Mountain, Maryland, with the intention of crossing the mountain through Turner's Gap, and driving the Confederates from their commanding positions on the summit, from which they could sweep with their artillery the narrow roads over which the Union troops must pass. The Seventeenth had been so recently organized and was so inexperienced in actual warfare that the men could not appreciate the desperate task assigned them until the enemy's shot and shell were crashing through their ranks. It was another "Taking of Lungtungpen," made famous by Kipling,—"'Tis the bhoys—the raw bhoys—that don't know fwat a bullet manes, an' wudn't care av

they did—that dhu the work. . . . Wud fifty seasoned sodgers have taken Lungtungpen in the dhark that way? No! They'd know the risk av fever and chill. Let alone the shootin'." When the order came for the Seventeenth to charge, the regiment, indifferent to the enemy calmly waiting behind their stone walls and other defenses, rushed through the storm of lead with mad cheers, and forced the Confederates to retreat down the slope of the mountain. The regiment lost 140 of the 500 men engaged, but earned the proud title of the "Stonewall Regiment."¹

Three days later the Seventeenth was again des-

¹ With regard to the conduct of the Seventeenth Michigan in the battle of South Mountain, General O. B. Willcox, the division commander, says: "The Seventeenth Michigan, Colonel Withington, performed a feat that may vie with any recorded in the annals of war, and set an example to the oldest troops. This regiment had not been organized a single month, and was composed of raw levies." (*Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies, Series I, Volume XIX, Part I, page 429.*)

Colonel B. C. Christ, the Brigade Commander, says: "Supported by the Seventy-ninth New York, the Seventeenth Michigan moved steadily forward until they arrived within good range, and then opened a fire on the enemy with terrible effect, . . . driving him in the utmost confusion across the field into the woods, and capturing a number of prisoners. Under any circumstances the conduct of both officers and men of this regiment was worthy of the highest commendation, but especially so when taking into consideration that they were mustered into service as late as the 21st of August, 1862, and that this was their first engagement." (*Ibid., page 437.*)

General McClellan, the army commander, also says: "General Willcox praises very highly the conduct of the Seventeenth Michigan in this advance—a regiment which had been organized scarcely a month, but which charged the advancing enemy in flank in a manner worthy of veteran troops." (*Ibid., page 50.*)

perately engaged at Antietam, Maryland, in that useless attempt to carry Burnside's Bridge when the narrow stream could have been easily forded above or below. The success of the regiment in gaining the opposite heights was at a fearful cost in killed and wounded.

"It is often asked—" Burrows writes,¹ "and I presume the same inquiry is made at home—why we did not advance after the battle of Antietam. The Rebels had been driven from every position they had taken, they had been defeated in two pitched battles, and were cowering under the banks of the Potomac. The whole of the Union forces had not been engaged, the soldiers were elated with their victories and eager to go forward, yet at the very moment when a word would have annihilated that whole Rebel army, not a gun was fired nor a man moved. For one whole day and night the Rebels were retreating across the Potomac under the very muzzles of our guns. Here the war might have been ended, but strategy forbade. The only excuse offered for this masterly blunder is that we were out of ammunition."

Unpreparedness! Had the North made ready for the civil struggle from the moment Fort Sumter was fired upon, victory would have been won within six months, instead of dragging over four awful years!

¹ November 1, 1862.

It is the same cry from this youthful captain in 1862 which we hear from every experienced army commander in 1917. The sentiment of the people at large, even of loyal Republicans, was in hearty accord with the despair and disgust of the soldiers in the field. This letter to Burrows from A. A. Knappen, his law partner (December 15, 1862), is graphically illuminating:

From A. A. Knappen

God only knows whether I am writing to a live man or a corpse! Yesterday's news of the battle of Fredericksburg reached us, and it was of a gloomy character. It told of panic in Sumner's Division and terrible slaughter—eight generals killed. I hope the news today will be more cheerful—will tell of a brilliant victory for our brave troops, the enemy routed and broken, and their artillery and commissary stores captured, and Burnside, with "On to Richmond" inscribed on his banner, pursuing the retreating foe. This would make millions of loyal hearts throb with pleasure and pride—it would be a rather novel sensation! What! pursue a flying foe! Preposterous, absurd! When have we done as rash a thing as that? But once or twice during the war. But I will not complain to one who feels just as intensely as I do, and more too. I know you are confident of

going to Richmond, and I hope you will see the inside of it. But I confess my faith is oozing out by degrees. There is no head or heart to the Administration sufficient to grapple with a mighty conspiracy. I fear there is too much weakness at the bottom of the Cabinet. To tell the truth, I am mad at the President's Message offering to pay for all slaves, whether belonging to Rebels or loyal men! There is the Major Key for you! Distrusting the power of our armies, and the same infernal regard for the sacredness of slavery! I would give more for the little finger of a Jackson or a Douglas in such a contest as this than I would for the whole President and Cabinet of today. Lincoln is weak, and Seward uses him to suit his great strategic purposes. I tremble while I hope for the best. The people here are getting more and more disgusted every day. The whole thing looks like child's play or a farce. There is so much vacillation and hesitating about measures until the golden moment has sped. It is enough to make one weep tears of blood. We know the soldiers want to do their work thoroughly and well, so that they can come home and rest easy, but politicians and speculators wish the war still to continue—and it hangs fire. But enough of this grumbling. I am satisfied that you must feel what I can but poorly express. . . .

Burrows closes his own letter last quoted with the following comment: "On the 26th inst. Burnside's Corps crossed the Potomac near Point of Rocks, and we at last stood upon the soil of the Old Dominion. The 'Grand Army of the Potomac' is in motion, and if it is defeated the soldiers are not at fault. McClellan has not yet crossed, but there is great activity along the Potomac, and we all hope that this is at last advance, and that our generals in the field and the apologists of treason at home will simply let the soldiers go forward. They will deal such blows upon the heads of this rebellious crew as will make all rebeldom resound with one universal shout for mercy."

After the battle of Antietam there was no active service of importance until the bitter struggle on December 13 at Fredericksburg, where the Michigan Seventeenth was again in the thickest of the fight. The severity of the campaign forced Burrows into the hospital after Fredericksburg. Suffering from exhaustion, he had become reduced in weight to eighty pounds, and he was granted leave of absence to recuperate. He writes home from Seminary Hospital, January 9, 1863: "I am going to 'walk the Halls of Congress' some day this week. You may look in the paper for a big speech if my health continues to improve!" Happy augury! Could he have fore-

seen how many speeches he was yet to deliver within those Halls?

His anticipated visit was postponed by the slowness of his convalescence until the latter part of February, but at last it became a realization. Washington had been to him almost a mythical city, and his imagination had clothed it with every beauty and perfection. Until now, his vision had been restricted to the rural districts of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan. His knowledge of the world outside had come to him wholly from others. To Wade and Giddings may be given the credit for having fired his enthusiasm, but it was that powerful attribute of imagination inherited from his mother which colored the pictures upon which his eyes rested. Washington in 1863 was far from being the model city one would judge from reading his description. The dome of the Capitol was but partly put in place; the Goddess of Liberty reposed near by, still unpacked,—as if questioning its right to raise its head in the Capital City of a country which was fighting for its existence; beneath the Senate Chamber, where the restaurant now is, were stored rations for the army, and Washington was the City Militant, in process of reconstruction, rather than the City Beautiful as it appeared to Burrows' enraptured eyes.

Still, as one smiles at the boyish enthusiasm, he

cannot fail to ask himself what youth of twenty-six today could possibly be stirred by such emotions as are described by Burrows when he found himself within the Senate Chamber,—or, feeling them, could express himself in such words of patriotism. This letter to his wife, written on February 28, 1863, immediately after his return from Washington to the camp of the Michigan Seventeenth at Newport News, Virginia, demonstrates how carefully he had followed those events of National importance which had brought about the present conflict:

“I hurried through the crowds which block up Pennsylvania Avenue, and soon found myself within the enclosure of the Capitol grounds. Nothing can be grander than this. Its winding walks paved with marble, its shady groves, its green plots, its sparkling fountains, present to the eye a scene of mingled beauty and grandeur. One can easily imagine himself within the walls of Damascus, wandering among its shady groves, and resting beneath its arched wood.

“You reach the Capitol by ascending stone steps, and from the porch of the Capitol you can see the whole city spread out before you like a map. The White House, the Smithsonian Institute, the Arsenal, and the hundred buildings of public interest and dwellings of beauty all stand out in bold relief. As you enter the Capitol the eye is dazzled with the mag-

nificence of the workmanship. You pass through its marble halls, and at length reach the gallery of the Senate and House. I had but a short time to remain in either branch, and while here I must confess that my mind was more occupied with the memories of the past than the scenes before me. The vast rotunda is crowded with paintings of the first class. Here is Webster, Calhoun, Clay, Adams, and Jackson,—all heroes. Here is Washington, the hero of the Revolution, the father of our country, represented at the proudest moment of his life when he received at Yorktown the sword of England's proudest warrior. Here is Washington as he surrendered his commission to the Continental Congress. You may see his flashing eye, the firmly-compressed lip, all speaking of that unconscious purpose, that fixed determination which made him the greatest of his time. May we ever cherish his memory, and never suffer the Government, of which he is the father, to be destroyed! Mighty warrior, patriot, and statesman, 'hail and farewell'!

"Here, too, is the representation of the landing of the Pilgrims, and of their first prayer on these wild and barbarous shores, driven here by the persecution of their fathers, hoping to find a land where they could worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. Here, too, is a representation of

their departure for their unknown homes, the parting blessing, the silent tear, the last firm grasp of the hand and warm pressure of the lips, the 'good bye' trembling on the tongue. All tell of that bitter parting, and that human sympathy and affection in 1620 was as strong and as pure as today. Here, too, is the representation of the baptism of Pocahontas. What a sublime spectacle it must have been! That wild, untutored Indian girl, bowing at the baptismal fount, and acknowledging her love for that Being who rules and governs us all. Religion tames the savage, purifies the soul, elevates our natures, and gives us something to live for here, and hope for hereafter. Real, honest Christianity is man's first duty. Every man should be a Christian, not a hypocrite. If there is one thing I despise above another it is the wearing of the cloak of religion to cover up sins and offences that 'smell to heaven.' I see so much of this that at times I am almost led to believe that there is no sincerity or honesty in Christianity itself,—that it is all a farce; but when I see the noble example of these honest Christians who died on the altar of their faith I cannot doubt that Christianity and obedience, honest and submissive to the government of the Supreme, is a duty we owe to ourselves, to our fellow-man, to our own kindred, and to our God.

“I fear I have digressed a little, but such pictures excite a thousand thoughts and ten thousand emotions. There were other paintings here, but my poor pen cannot do them justice; hence I will leave them, trusting that the time is not far distant when you can have the pleasure of seeing them yourself. Let us go back to the House.

“I cannot describe this room. The stairs leading to the gallery are made of Egyptian marble, costly and rich. The gallery extends around the whole room, and down beneath is the assembly of the Nation’s representatives. I stayed but a moment. The Senate Chamber is constructed on a similar plan, but more elegant. Both Houses were in session. Here is the first great battlefield of this Rebellion,—not of sword and bayonet, but of mind. Here is the spot where slaveholders have been crushed and routed by the mighty artillery of irresistible logic and eloquence, and this Rebellion is but a natural consequence of their defeat. The Southerner, overpowered in this greater battle, resorted to brute force to defeat logic. It was natural. But what pitched battles have been fought within these walls! Here a Calhoun hurled the first missiles of treason to this Government in his struggle for State rights. His logic seemed irresistible, his eloquence was overpowering, and for a moment he wore the crown of com-

plete triumph. The whole South, with its minions at the North, sent up their shout of victory, and exultation ran mad. The North was filled with gloom and sadness. Massachusetts lay bleeding at the feet of South Carolina, and it needed a master workman to bind up her wounds. But we did not wait long. Daniel Webster, the Godlike and immortal Webster, stepped into the arena and unmasked his batteries. Then the Nation was breathless. They had felt the power of the enemy, and they feared the result of the contest; but Webster knew his strength. He threw up no fortifications, no breastworks of sophistry, but came out on the broad field of truth, and opened upon the enemy. It needed but a few shots to tell us that there was a master hand at the guns. Stone after stone was falling from the fortifications of the enemy, and finally it all crumbled to the ground. South Carolina was humbled. Its bold defender was routed, and still the immortal Webster poured forth his missiles of eloquence and logic till no doubt South Carolina and its chivalrous defender secretly plead for mercy. Yet he would not stop. His great heart was full, and it must out. And on he went, and still he thundered until the enemy's works were a mass of ruins, and victory complete. He buried South Carolina so low that she was fit for naught but treason. She never can be resur-

rected. The men of the old Bay State shed tears like girls; and as I stood in the gallery where they stood methinks I could hear the echo of those words, 'Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable.'

"But he has passed away,—peace to his ashes. I could not but remember, too, as I was hearing Sumner speak, the battle he fought, the honors he received, and the victory he won. He, too, was fighting against this same power which is now fighting us in the field. They were then striving to fasten the bloody fangs of slavery upon that infant State of Kansas, and Sumner sprang to her side, and raised her from its hateful embrace. He baffled the insolent foe. To meet his logic with logic was simply impossible. Error might as well think of conquering truth. The bludgeon was called in, the argument of tyrants. Here the first blood of this Rebellion was shed, and for the second time treason was routed. The Southerner became convinced that to fight battles in our legislative halls was sure defeat, and that error could never conquer truth, except perchance with the sword. And they will learn ere long that even this bloody weapon is impotent to stay the onward march of liberty and humanity."

Creased with the folds of over fifty years, the ink faded, and the writing in some places made illegible

by a fire from which they were at one time rescued, nearly a hundred letters still exist which passed between the youthful captain at the front and his wife at home,—the Jennie of his Madison Seminary days, whose estimate of her prospective husband we have already read. The “giant intellect which threatens some future day to make the world tremble” she still recognizes, for she writes him (October 28, 1862): “My present would indeed be a dreary desert were it not for the bright, cheerful spots your letters mark. They in a measure compensate for the absence of your own loved self. I don’t believe any one ever wrote such good letters as you do. I am sure I never read any that were half equal to them.”

They are, indeed, remarkable documents, filled with graphic descriptions of camp and field, analytical comments upon the various movements of the Army and its commanders, burning hatred of the “traitors” which required years to appease, lofty loyalty to the cause of the Union, and with it all a tenderness toward the little woman he has left behind which is humanly practical in its expression. These letters require little explanatory comment, but tell their own story of the relations which existed between this soldier-husband in his early twenties and the beloved wife and little daughter left behind.

Their chief interest, however, lies not in their value

as contributions to the literature of the Civil War, but rather as human documents portraying an unusual personality. The departure of the youthful husband to the front was a tragedy to Jennie, but to him it was the event of his life. For nearly ten years he had made the ideals of the Republican Party his bone and sinew; he had expounded them on every possible occasion, he had lived them every moment of his existence. With the call to arms came the first opportunity for tangible personal expression. The onward march of the Crusaders had begun! Aside from this, these letters show the boyish enjoyment of the novel experiences which came with the enlarged horizon. He omits no detail in the description of his camp and camp-life; he bursts into eloquent and poetical diction on the shores of the James; he lashes the "traitors" with a fury which represents his years of cumulative loyalty to his cause; he shows his youth in the bubbling joy of administering the oath to the sullen Southerners while performing his duties as Provost Marshal. The early opportunity given him to display his courage under fire demonstrates the sincerity of his devotion to his principles, but the fact remains that, despite the dangers and the hardships, Burrows' army experiences filled him with a keen enjoyment entirely unappreciated by the sympathetic and suffering wife who kept her lonely vigil at home.

Let us read some fragments from her letters, written with fear gripping at her heart, and with dread uncertainty adding to her terrors. Here we shall find patriotism sadly mixed with love and anxiety for her personal hero. The lofty sentiments, the outbursts of loyalty, the poetic communions which mark the letters of the Doer are conspicuous by their absence in those of the Waiting One, yet who shall say that her rôle did not require equal courage and the same sublime self-sacrifice!

"Tuesday, October 28, 1862

"I wish I could make my letters to you interesting. But there doesn't anything happen here worthy of note. There is nothing thought or talked of except war, and it is like switching off the track to write about anything else. 'Where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also.' At the present time, my treasure is in the army, and of course my thoughts tend in that direction. I learned by today's paper that a forward movement of the entire Army of the Potomac is contemplated. It is what the people in general, and Horace Greeley in particular, have been clamoring for, and I suppose it is all right; but I tremble when I think of the terrible sacrifice of life that must follow. This Rebellion has attained to such gigantic growth that rapid and energetic action is necessary to stay it. As you say, the sooner it is

crushed the better for the Nation. I fear that we are on the eve of another murderous and closely-contested conflict. The prophecy borne of the public mind is that we shall be victorious, and this war thereby will be sooner terminated. But you may fall, and I—O Father pity and spare me. . . .

“Your faith that you will return inspires me with confidence. Cæsar, if you do come home (and I believe you will) the dark days will serve to make the future so much brighter. If earnest prayer will save you, then shall I see you again. I hope and trust. . . . You have acted a noble part and I am proud of you . . . and sister Meda has perfect confidence that you will come back. She thinks you have a work to do and will be spared to accomplish it. . . .

“Cæsar, how sorry I felt for you when I read about your building a chimney and then it smoked. You may believe that I had one good cry over your hardships. . . .

“One night, just before going to bed, I asked little Meda if she didn’t want to look at Papa’s likeness. She turned her little sad face toward me and said, ‘No, Mamma, for it will make me cry if I do. It almost makes me cry to think of him.’ She continues to pray for you every night. It would make you laugh to hear her give the Lord instructions for

your benefit. She has perfect faith that her little pleadings will save you. Heaven grant that they may!"

"Sabbath Eve, November 2, 1862

"Do you ever think what my feelings must be when I realize the hardships that you are constantly enduring, and know that you are marching on a relentless foe, and think that perhaps you are already suffering on the field of strife with no one to care for or relieve you. Oh, the thought is distracting! How willingly would I help bear the hardships and brave the dangers with you if I only had the privilege! All I can do is to hope and pray for you. . . .

"If this war could end and you come home I know I should be the happiest person that ever lived. Others may enjoy and appreciate the coming of their husbands, but I do not believe any one would feel so supremely blessed as I should. While you are nobly battling in defence of our injured country I will earnestly pray the Father to spare and protect you."

"Wednesday, November 5, 1862

"You are occupying dangerous ground, and my anxiety for you is most intense. I don't see what keeps you from being sick. I should think you would be completely worn out. My very heart aches for you. You tell me not to worry about you. I

wish you also would tell me how I can help it. When I know that you are suffering I must suffer too. My fears for your safety tell me that you are dearer than my own life. . . . I am going to coax you to resign before long if I can. I feel a kind of confidence that you will certainly come home. I wish it were possible for you to come home before another battle is fought. But I know your brave spirit too well. It is useless for me to ask you to leave your post while danger is so near. But do not be reckless of your precious life. I do not ask you to shirk your duty, only just be as careful as you can for my sake as well as your own. . . .

"The thought that you must engage in another murderous conflict makes me perfectly wretched, but I will not worry you with my own sad feelings; you have enough to endure. I can only pray for you and wait the result. You do not know how thankful I am that you have confidence in and rely upon Divine aid . . . each day is an age to me. . . . When you are lonely, think of this, that you are occupying my entire thoughts."

"Friday, November 14, 1862

"I do not even dare to think of the coming conflict—what shall I do when it is a present reality? It may bring death to mine and me. . . . How glad I am that you have 'drafted' you a horse. Meda says,

‘Now I wish I had gone to war with Papa, for I know he would let me ride on behind him.’ . . .

“How I love to think about your coming home. Heaven grant that the bright, joyful hope may not prove an illusion. . . . When you think about going to another engagement haven’t you any fears as to the result to yourself? If prayers will save you then you will be preserved; but others have been prayed for and still have been sacrificed. But I will hope. . . .

“I did not finish my letter yesterday. I got to thinking about our National affairs and of the danger that menaces you at every step, and I could not write. . . .

“When you went away we were in doubt respecting Lottie’s fate. The doubt has given way to a dead certainty. Lottie’s discharge has been signed by a higher authority than earth can produce. . . . I need your sympathy and I know I have it. . . . Dear as that brother was to me, my grief is not to be compared with what it would be if you had fallen instead. May kind Heaven spare me a second bereavement. . . . Good bye, my dear. Oh, how cruel those words sound!”

“Sabbath Day, November 16, 1862

“You speak of our Army going to Richmond. Before Richmond is reduced thousands of loyal,

precious lives must be yielded up. Although it is said, as soon as the Democrats come into power, that this fearful contest will be ended by a compromise. I know what you would say to this, but, Cæsar dear, if anything like an honorable compromise could be effected wouldn't it be better than to continue this wholesale slaughter? I know you will say that an honorable compromise is impossible at this stage of the issue. I am convinced that neither the Government nor the Rebels will yield so long as a remnant of our opposing armies remains. I cannot see where the end will be. As you say, 'Annihilation to the South.' I endorse a hearty amen to that proposition, but can we carry it out? With so many despicable Northern traitors and Rebel sympathizers among us I fear we cannot do it. Heaven knows I will be glad to see the sun go down for the last time on every traitor. There are a good many even here on the Reserve who claim to be good Unionists, but whose acts show them to be strong pro-slavery, anti-Administration, anti-war men. But you know all this as well as I. Oh, how I wish it was rightly ended! But we must wait. This wearing suspense must be endured. . . . Yours for union and reunion,

"JENNIE."

Whether because of the prayers of the devoted wife or by virtue of the conviction of the admiring sister that he would be preserved for a higher destiny, or both, Burrows had passed through the perils of actual engagement at South Mountain, Antietam, and Fredericksburg, with nothing more serious than exhaustion. After his release from Seminary Hospital, he returned to his regiment at Newport News, where he settled down for an extended period. His letters at this time give a detailed description of camp and camp life, and also portray his mental attitude. An interesting feature throughout is the complete absence of any reference to his sufferings or privations, yet the records of the Seventeenth Michigan bear testimony to the presence of both. The soldier-husband emphasizes the bright spots only,—and for obvious reasons:

February 28, 1863

We reached Fort Monroe about seven in the morning. Here we were compelled to remain until ten before a boat would leave for Newport News, which is some eight miles distant by water. I was glad that it happened so, for it gave me an opportunity to visit the Fort. There is nothing here but war implements. There are plenty of buildings, but they are all connected with the War Department. The Fort comprises eighty acres, and is said to be the strongest.

Its walls of stone and frowning guns seem to defy an attack. The inside of the Fort is laid out in walks, and shade trees give it a beauty and a pleasantness which in the Summer season must be truly delightful. A little distance from the Fort lay several war vessels and a monitor. There are stores and groceries here, and newspapers, and, in fact, Fort Monroe and its surroundings present the appearance of a busy little town. There was a magnificent hotel here, but since this war it has been torn down, as it obstructed the view from the Fort up the James River. . . . At ten we took the boat for Newport News. Here we could see the wreck of the *Congress* and the *Cumberland*, which latter boat went down with one hundred and fifty men. Norfolk is but a short distance from here. Here at Newport News the *Merrimac* coolly destroyed our boats, and rode king of the seas. But that night the *Monitor* came, and after hours of hard fighting drove the *Merrimac* back, wounded and dying, and saved Fortress Monroe and the Nation. Had it not been for the timely arrival of the *Monitor* no doubt but the *Merrimac* would have entered Baltimore or Washington. . . .

The camping ground of the Corps is the most beautiful I ever beheld. Each regiment seems to strive to excel its neighbor in decorating its grounds. Our camp is called "Camp Withington." It is laid out

in regular streets. The streets are graded and swept daily, so that the camp presents the appearance of a nice city. The men and officers have been supplied with new tents, which are large and comfortable. Shelter tents are "played out." The boys have set out large evergreen trees through the streets, and in front of the officers' tents and in front of their own tents, so that our grounds look like a forest, and the clean white tent contrasts beautifully with the deep green of the pine. . . .

I arrived at my command a little after noon, and I need not tell you of the warm greetings I met. All seemed glad to see me. You know that when I left the army several officers were in one tent. Now I have a tent of my own, clean and new. After seeing the Colonel, and getting mustered, I thought I would put up my tent. The boys did it for me, and made me a nice bunk and table, and it would do your soul good to look in here now and see me sitting in a chair which I bought in Cleveland, before a table covered with books, beside a bed raised up, made of pine boughs. My trappings are hung up about my tent, so in fact it looks quite like home, with the exception of two little articles,—yourself and Meda. Will you furnish me with these? I have a thick double blanket to put under me and a comfortable to put over me. Such is our camp. As to eating, we have oysters by

the pailful, as we are not more than twenty rods from the water, soft bread, ham, coffee, and everything almost, even good potatoes. I have sent for a camp stove, and then my furniture will be complete. No regiment could be pleasanter situated.

CAMP WITHINGTON, NEWPORT NEWS,

Monday Eve, March 2, 1863

Tonight the moon is throwing its mellow light over sleeping Nature, and I have been walking in front of my tent, ruminating upon the past, and building hopes for the future. Could bright fancies of the mind be woven into realities how many Edens would spring into happy being! Better that it is not granted us though, for if it were true we might not look higher. But I will shut out the world, and breathe a prayer for you and ours. . . .

Tuesday Evening, March 3, 1863

The evenings now are delightful, and it is inexpressible joy to wander along the shores of the beautiful and classic James. Upon its bosom once rode the gem of empire; now its waters are ruffled by the black monitors of war, struggling for that empire's perpetuity. What a place for thought is the bank of some mighty water! As I stood tonight, and beheld in the far distance some moonlit wave nearing the shore, until at length it perished beneath the waters, I thought how similar were earth's anticipated joys.

We look out upon the broad sea of life, and watch eagerly for the approach of some anticipated joy, but ere it reaches us some cruel wave of fate buries it beneath its dark water. But it is not always thus.

NEWPORT NEWS, VIRGINIA,
Tuesday, March 10, 1863

You say people are aroused a little over the Conscription Bill, and, Jennie, you did get off a little patriotism, didn't you? Ha!-ha! Aren't you glad now that your "hubby" is in the war? You couldn't crow so if your "hubby" was one of the shirks, could you? He who is able to strike one blow and remains at home, in times like these, is a traitor to his country, to his family, and to his God. What a proud thing it is to be drafted in this war! I had rather die than be dragged up to my duty and whipped to perform it! . . .

On this same date, which was before the transferal of his regiment to the Western Army, Burrows wrote to one of the Kalamazoo papers:

"Much is said at home about the demoralization of the army, and the daily papers, circulated through our camps, are filled with positive assertions that the army has become a lawless mob. Never was a greater falsehood written; and it is well known where it has its origin. It springs from the poisoned tongue of 'Copperheads,' who have done nothing but hiss and

sting from the beginning of this bloody rebellion. They have opposed every measure of the Administration that aimed a blow at traitors. The Confiscation Act was unconstitutional; the Emancipation Proclamation was barbarous; the suspension of the 'habeas corpus' was tyrannical; and our defeats have been followed with utter demoralization. Strange how Party pride and Party prejudice will blind the human heart! Strange that there are those at the North, reared into manhood under the benign influence of a free Government, who would destroy that Government to satisfy Party animosity. I should think that in their waking hours, and in their hideous dreams, the bleeding form of a betrayed Republic would rise before them and shout in their ears, 'Guilty! guilty!' But no; they are deaf to the cries of their country. Their Party is their idol. To it they bow down in blind adoration, forgetting their children, their country, and their God. But we will tell them this, that the Republic will live in spite of them. That the soldier is not demoralized. That the Confiscation Act and the Emancipation Proclamation are stars of hope by which we draw our swords to strike for Liberty and Union! That he who dares breathe the word 'Compromise' upon any other terms than unconditional submission to the National Government is a traitor doubly damned. The graves of our murdered

brothers cry out against it. We will have but one country, one flag, one common Union!"

Again writing to his wife, Burrows pays his respects to the Pacifists of 1863:

NEWPORT NEWS, VIRGINIA,
Thursday, March 12, 1863

The Copperheads are quiet now, but they are only winding themselves up for a more desperate assault the coming Fall. Peace is their motto. Soon they will throw their foul banner to the breeze, and I fear that thousands of the sick-hearted at the North will take shelter underneath its enticing shadow. But woe betide us when we shall accept peace based upon any other foundation than reconstruction and reunion! If compromise is effected by giving to slavery more territory, we shall cover ourselves with dishonor and disgrace, and leave our children a legacy of shame, and when we have done all this the war is not over. Slavery and freedom will war with each other till one is conquered and annihilated. It is for the people of the North to say which it shall be. God grant that American liberty shall not find its grave here! Here it was born, and here let it grow and prosper through all time. . . .

The dramatic entrance by which the Seventeenth Michigan became a part of the Union forces made life

at Newport News an anti-climax. With nothing beyond the daily routine to record, Burrows' letters home are filled with introspection and ruminations not ordinarily associated with the soldier's life:

NEWPORT NEWS, VIRGINIA,
Saturday, March 14, 1863

Home letters are camp joys. They lift the dark curtain of the present, and point us to our future Eden. Glad reminders of what we were, and what we may yet be when the bloody tide of war shall ebb, and the almighty *fiat* shall be stamped upon it! Peace be still! Happy, happy time! And yet how many bright dreams, how many cherished hopes will lie buried beneath that silent flood! War! the maniac's weapon, the mighty power that leads truant reason back to its deserted throne, and reinstates it there, all powerful and omnipotent. But I trust this war is nearly closed, that history is writing the last act of this bloody tragedy. And when the curtain shuts out the last scene, may we turn from this sickening sight, a wiser, freer, and nobler people, with liberty triumphant and tyranny dethroned. But until this glorious consummation let the tide roll on, bloody and remorseless, till treason is engulfed beneath its gurgling water, and the proud Ship of State, freighted with the world's idle hope, shall ride triumphant into the harbor of peace.

NEWPORT NEWS, VIRGINIA,
Wednesday Evening, March 18, 1863

When I think of the desolation and havoc this war is making, when I in fancy follow in its bloody wake and gather up the shattered hopes and blighted prospects of a once happy people, I cannot but wonder for a moment why a just and outraged God does not hurl thunderbolts of destruction upon the head of every guilty traitor, and blast that hideous embryo of despotic empire. Great God! how long must we suffer? How long must the thunders of war break the quiet of this people! Yet it is just. Well did Jefferson say, "I tremble for my country when I remember that God is just." Oh, Jennie, how I hate a traitor! Hate is a tame word,—I loathe them! And while I cling to my home as the Eden of earth, I cannot bear the thought of quitting the field until every traitor shall bite the dust, or bow in humble submission to the flag of my country. Dear old emblem of Liberty, how I love you! Must your bright stars go down, must your clear blue be shrouded in darkness? Never, so long as there is an arm to strike! Never did I realize so fully the awful consequences of this struggle. We must either be conquered or conquer. If we fail—heavens, what a future! Liberty dead, freedom buried, and the world's last hope extinguished! Then the knee must

learn to bow to every tyrant's nod, and our own children shriek beneath the lash of remorseless nobility. What then will be our homes and their joys? Blighted all. But this must not, cannot, shall not be. Treason shall die. The flag of our country shall again wave over every foot of American soil, and her stars shall mount undimmed into her cloudless blue. Traitors shall reverence it, treason shall cower beneath it and tremble in its holy presence, for it is our flag, God's, and Liberty's.

I know how you and those North suffer in our absence, yet you must all be stout-hearted in these times, and when we have conquered we will return to you to enjoy with you the peace we have purchased. Be brave, heroic, and true. Mould the heart of man to daring deeds, and counsel naught but honor. Remember that these are times that try men's souls, and that the result of this contest will be felt to the latest generation. Here is a milestone on the highway of empire. Let us not write upon it, "Perished here." All the nations are looking toward us; Liberty lies bleeding at our feet, and cries for help. Oppressed families are stretching their bleeding hands toward us, and imploring our aid. May we strike till Liberty's wounds are bound up, and Humanity disen-thrallled. Compromise? Never! Never surrender as long as one drop of blood warms the patriotic

heart. If we are true to our duty, true to ourselves, and true to posterity we will come out of this struggle gloriously triumphant, and transmit to our children a country redeemed and a liberty unfettered. . . .

CHAPTER III

THE SOLDIER-HUSBAND [*continued*]. 1863-1864

THE Seventeenth was in Virginia and Maryland until March, 1863, when it was transported, with the Ninth Corps, to Louisville, Kentucky. It was stationed in various parts of the State until ordered to join General Grant, then at Vicksburg, Mississippi. Captain Burrows records some of his experiences while in Louisville in letters to his wife:

UNITED STATES HOTEL,
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY, *March 30, 1863*

It would do your soul good to visit this State in these times. You find no neutral men or women. The Union people are warm, true friends, and you cannot be with them but a moment before you seem to have known them for years. While marching up town on our arrival I met a lady and gentleman who stopped me. Both shook hands warmly, welcomed us to the State, and their dark Southern eyes, moistened with tears, told of the noble, true spirit within. . . .

Two of the most prominent ladies at the supper were Mrs. Johnson and Mrs. Haskin,—both unflinchingly loyal women. They asked me to call upon

them before I left the city. . . . Mrs. Johnson has spent most of her time in the hospitals of the city, and was at the battle of P. Landing, administering to the wounded and dying. I wish you could see her dark eyes flash as she talks of this Rebellion. She is surrounded by traitors, and yet from every window in her house waves the Stars and Stripes. When Bragg was within five miles of the city and demanding its surrender, and thousands of families were moving across the river, she threw our flag from every window, and said that she would not desert it,—never! General Nelson rode by the house and complimented her upon her bravery. Mrs. Haskin is Mrs. Johnson's daughter, and she and her husband were born there, and are both unflinching in their loyalty. I should like to have him talk with some of our Copperheads at the North. Oh! how he despises them! He is a slaveholder, but says that slavery is the cause of this trouble, and that the war must not end till the last vestige of it is swept from the land. He says that if the South succeed, and Kentucky links her destiny with her, he will abandon his State. . . .

How pleasant it is for the soldier to find such warm greetings in a traitor's land! But do not think that all the people are so. In walking along the streets we could easily tell the loyal people. The "Reb" ladies are the meanest creatures I ever saw. We

would meet them, and they would turn out as far as the sidewalk would allow, and even hold up their dresses, as if passing something too foul to touch. Miserable fools! I wonder if they thought it offended us! We met four or five little girls, and they turned up their noses, and Captain Tyler remarked, "You are a little Reb," when the whole group joined in saying, "We are Rebels too."

BARDSTOWN, KENTUCKY,
April 1, 1863

I wish we had more Butlers. But it would do us no good if we had, for our weak-kneed Administration would lay them on the shelf at the behest of every conservative demagogue. The President knows that Jeff Davis and his clique don't like Butler, and to please them he has deprived the Nation of his services! Out with such a milk-and-water man! But let it work. All may be well yet. . . .

And all was yet to be well. The boy-Captain, heart-broken over the scenes of death and desolation, could not see it, but even with his criticism he had faith to believe it. The little space of two years gave him the power to understand the quiet but far-seeing, long-suffering Lincoln.

LEBANON, KENTUCKY,
Sabbath Eve, April 5, 1863

When we entered this place we took possession of the printing press, and tomorrow we strike off the first

issue of the "Union Vidette," as we call it. I will send you a copy, Jennie. It is real fun to soldier out here in Kentucky, because the people are divided and so earnest. The traitors are spunky and insolent, the Union people warm and true. . . .

News of the illness of his little daughter brings out an expression of the depth of his devotion. Even the threatened dissolution of the Nation is forgotten in his anxiety for her health and life:

LEBANON, KENTUCKY,
Wednesday, April 8, 1863

I am pained that our little darling has been sick. Poor thing! Has she not suffered enough! What crime has she committed that she must thus be tormented even in infancy! Pardon that thought, that seems to reflect upon Him who orders all things well. Oh! Jennie, take good care of her. Do not suffer a single care or sorrow to ruffle the sunny deep of her gentle spirit. Remember a father's love for her, how he dotes upon her, and shapes his every act for her future good. And keep her! Oh, Jennie, what a world this would be to us if that star in our heaven should go down! Heaven spare us the affliction! Jennie, do not take out her little letters, please. I want to see them. Those tracings made by her hand would be meaningless to others, but to you and me they have a language, oh, how dear! I could sit

down in my lonely tent and read her letters for hours together. Let her send them, please. . . .

It is difficult for the present generation to appreciate the depth of the hatred which entered into the struggle, or to reconcile the expression which follows with the tender words which precede. Yet these are extracts from the same letter, and this ghastly wish is written by a man who, under normal circumstances, was generous and forgiving:

“A rumor is prevalent here that Charleston is taken. Glory to God! I hope that hell-hole of treason is ours, and that the flag of our country waves over its ruins. I would like Byron’s dream of ‘Darkness’ to be to the people of Charleston a bitter reality, ‘for they truly did keep in that city a mass of holy things for an unholy usage.’ Let only two of that city survive, and let them be enemies. Let them rake up with their skeleton hands the dying embers of their blighted hopes, behold each other’s hideous aspect and die! How I would like to be in Charleston, and see the lackeys bow to the flag they once would spit upon! This Rebellion is dead! Its fall is sealed, and the men who instigated it will ‘go back to the foul earth from whence they sprung, upwept, unhonored, and unsung.’ ”

Four days later Captain Burrows receives fuller news from home, and expresses his joy over his

daughter's convalescence. In the same letter he bursts into a patriotic frenzy which today seems overwrought, yet in the light of his later services to the country no one can doubt its sincerity. Those were the days of high-sounding expressions, and what Burrows writes is but the same language as that with which he later swayed his audiences, and which was accepted by his hearers as the highest form of oratory. It was what Jennie would expect from her hero, and to say less would have seemed to her a step backwards in what she had learned to adore:

CAMP OF THE SEVENTEENTH MICHIGAN INFANTRY,
LEBANON, KENTUCKY, *Sabbath, April 12, 1863*

Yesterday we received our back mail, and it was a day of mingled joy and sadness. For many it brought the good intelligence of the health and happiness of friends and kindred; to some the sad tale of sickness, suffering, and death. As for myself, receiving four priceless letters from you, informing me of the illness and recovery of our darling pet, I feel like one who all unconscious treads the verge of some terrible precipice, and wakes to see the yawning gulf beneath, the danger past, and thanks his God that he is safe. Oh! had she died, should she die, while I am here away from her, my own unanchored soul, rocked and lashed by the wild surges of despair, would drift to ruin and death. It will not, can not

be! Jennie, I need not tell you how I idolize her. Search your own heart, and measure my love. She is our all, our only one, and without her what would that home be to which we are looking, and for which we are toiling and sacrificing? A blighted Eden, a garden without a flower, a paradise without a rose, a Heaven without a God. . . .

Jennie, I think your fears are too great. Should we be brought face to face with our hell-born foes, fear not the result, for the God of justice rides on the storm, and though thousands of brave and manly hearts should perish in the contest, if we but gain the victory, redeem our country, and reinstate order and peace, the sacrifice though costly should be freely given. Let the storm rage, let the earth tremble beneath the leaden tread of marshaling hosts. Let the mountains speak the echoes of our cannon. Let rivers of blood roll from East to West, from North to South, until our land shall be woven with arteries; let carnage and devastation sweep over the land in mad revelry, if over all this ruin the flag of our country, dear emblem of Liberty, can float in triumph. Then do not fear for me. If we move forward, follow us with your prayers, and in the hour of battle the memory of you and ours will nerve our arms and bid us "strike until the last armed foe expires"

You have spoken in several of your letters of a

letter I wrote to you which you say was "rather extraordinary." I do not remember it. If it was burdened with patriotism, it was only the out-breathings of a heart wedded to country and liberty. It must have been written at one of those moments in my life when I was aroused to the consciousness of the times in which we live, and the terrible responsibilities devolving upon us. A Nation is ours to preserve or to destroy. The memories of the past, the hopes of the present, and the fond anticipations of the future, all hang breathless upon our action. The soul is weighed down under this load of responsibility, and agonizes to think that it is doing so little. Show me the star of duty, and I will follow it though I perish. I know not whether it be to fight the armed traitor in the field, or the skulking sneak that hides under the flag he is too cowardly to betray. Oh, how I hate the traitor, and above all a Northern one, who, with no excuse but Party prejudice, would destroy a Government to satisfy Party pride. Oh! you miserable offscourings of a polluted Party! Language is inadequate to portray your crimes. History can but give their outline. They are as black as hell. Your own children will hate you. Your kindred will forsake you. Traitors in arms will disown you. All posterity will curse you. Your country will disinherit you. And history will embalm your names in

eternal infamy. The Tories of the Revolution were angels by the side of you. . . .

Of his transfer to the Western Army, Burrows writes to the Kalamazoo paper, under date of April 22, 1863:

“On the evening of the 18th of last month, while at Newport News, Va., we received orders to be ready to march at daylight on the following morning, with four days’ rations and sixty rounds of cartridges. Such preparations were decidedly ominous, and indicative of a long march, perhaps a skirmish, and gave birth to a thousand surmises and as many vague and groundless rumors. But the morning dispelled all doubts, for a report that we were going westward had settled down into a well-grounded belief, and with light hearts we struck tents, slung knapsacks, and bade ‘good by’ to the Army of the Potomac. But glad as we were to link our destiny with the victorious forces of the West, it was, nevertheless, with many feelings of regret that we took leave of an army which, however much it may have suffered from the treachery or ambition of its leaders, is, notwithstanding, unconquerable in purpose and invincible in arms. On the morning of the 19th, the First and Second Divisions of the Ninth Army Corps (the Third Division having previously been ordered to Suffolk,

Va.) marched to the landing, and took transports for Baltimore. From the landing could be distinctly seen the wrecks of the *Cumberland* and *Congress*, which resisted the approach of the rebel *Merrimac* when our *Monitor* came to the rescue, and drove that monster engine of treason back to its dark moorings.

“In the afternoon we weighed anchor, and for some reason sailed for Norfolk, where we were compelled by a severe storm to remain nearly twenty-four hours. Curiosity led me to visit the city. It is now almost wholly deserted, its places of business are closed, its once busy mart is as silent as the grave, and as I passed along its narrow, dirty streets, dimly lighted by a few flickering lamps, no sound fell upon the ear but the hollow echo of the measured tread of the sentinel as he paced his lonely beat. On the 19th we again set sail for Baltimore, where we landed on the morning of the 22d. Here, for the first time, we received positive intelligence of our destination; and when it was announced that we were to be in the Department of the hero of the Ninth Army Corps, one wild shout of exultation burst from the lips of that devoted soldiery. In the evening we again took up our line of march, or rather took our quarters in the cars, and rolled on toward the waters of the Ohio. Our trip was a pleasant one, and on every side the eye was regaled by a thousand scenes, new to us, and

full of interest.—Harper's Ferry was a point of universal attraction. Here treason and loyalty had struggled in deadly conflict, and had alternately triumphed. Here, too, treachery had worked its dark and damning purpose and received here its first punishment. Today Harper's Ferry is a mass of ruins."

Turning again to his home, he tells of his surroundings in his new camp, emphasizing the comforts to ease the anxiety:

CAMP OF THE SEVENTEENTH MICHIGAN INFANTRY,
LEBANON, KENTUCKY, *Sabbath Eve, April 19, 1863*

My tent, twelve feet square, is pitched on a beautiful eminence near a pleasant wood on the right, a lofty mountain in front, and the quiet, unattractive city of Lebanon on the left rear. The floor of my tent is of God's own make, and therefore quite durable. I am seated at a table of my own manufacture, on the right of which is my fireplace, on the left my "soldier's couch." Perhaps you would like to know what sort of fireplace I have. The Yankees are great for invention. Well, we dig a hole in the ground about a foot deep and a foot wide, running from the inner corner of our tent to some ten feet outside. This ditch we cover with flat stones, all except about a foot on either end. Outside I have built a chimney of sods, about four feet high. When this is completed, we build our fire in the tent in this ditch, and

it works to a charm and makes our tents quite comfortable. My bed is made by driving four crotches in the ground, and putting slender poles from head to foot. These I have covered with boughs first, and now I have about a foot of straw on top of these. Upon this I spread the fly to my tent and one blanket, and cover myself with blankets, and it is gloriously comfortable. My bed is a complete success. My table is made out of rough boards, but covered with newspapers in the latest approved style. I wish you could look in here and see my table tonight, ornamented with books. You know I brought some, and pictures. You know what pictures I mean—yours and Meda's. They constitute the chief ornaments,—at least to my heart. I have walled them in with some beautiful geological specimens which I have obtained in this State of natural curiosities, and inside this breastwork of rocks I have a wreath of flowers, with which the earth in this region is brightened even at this time of the year. My table would grace a parlor. My living is good, and I have everything which I could expect in the field. And I think I shall enjoy our Summer campaign if it is not too warm, and we are not compelled to perform too many long marches. . . .

There was a ball here in Lebanon on last Friday evening, given for the benefit of the officers. I did

not attend. I think it does not look well for officers to so far forget their own families as to spree it with the fast Kentucky ladies. I told you about ——. He returned to our regiment the first of last week, and he made a perfect fool of himself by palming himself off as a bachelor, and dancing with a young girl all night, and this too, coming direct from the embrace of wife and children. Poor fool! I do not say but such a course could be pursued innocently, but I do say that it is unbecoming, and would do violence to the affections of a pure heart. For myself, my thoughts are at home, and no pleasure is so sweet to me here in the field as remaining in my tent, ornamented with the pictures of wife and child, and talking with them in that language of the heart, silent yet deep. Holy hours! Dear cherished memories! . . .

Jennie's righteous indignation blazes forth in her reply. Not even the assurances that "the course pursued" by the offenders "may be innocent" offers any palliation. Her own tears and heart-aches and loneliness are too real to reconcile pleasure or lightness of action with the grimness of war:

May 10, 1863

"You write that some of the married officers are playing themselves off as single men, and carrying on

flirtations with the fast ladies of Kentucky. Shame upon them! They have no respect for themselves or regard for the happiness of those loved ones they leave at home. A lifetime of the strongest moral rectitude will scarcely suffice to restore that confidence to their injured wives which they are now so wantonly destroying. Better both for them and their families that they never live to return to the homes which they have dishonored, and the hearts they have betrayed. Perhaps they think because they are so far from home their friends may never hear of their miserable conduct. But sooner or later it will surely reach them. There are ready friends whose business it is to retail such precious scandal. You say they may be innocent—I cannot agree with you. Innocence and truth never prompt acts so cruel and censurable. They may be thoughtless, but not innocent; and if their evil acts are persisted in they merit the scorn and loathing of every true man and woman. . . .”

While at Columbia, Kentucky, because of Captain Burrows' physical inability to endure the full routine of the soldier's life, he was made Provost Marshal, and the opportunity which this gave him to enforce discipline upon the sullen Southern non-combatants filled him with a joy which was almost unholy. These letters are boyish in the expression of his exuberance:

LEBANON, *Sabbath Eve, April 26, 1863*

The late order of General Burnside is making the "Rebs" quake in this quarter, and I am glad to see it. The people have been allowed to talk treason too long, and now they must stop. Yesterday a Presbyterian minister in this place, pastor of the leading church, was arrested, and a Rebel officer found concealed in his house. He will have to pack up his duds and go to "his friends." That is glorious! Then there is another beautiful thing in this arrangement,—all officers and soldiers are called upon to enforce this order. If I don't arrest the first man or woman that dares say one word against our Government, then my name is not Cæsar! We will have some good times trying and hanging these vipers! We will make them hunt their holes!

COLUMBIA, ADAIR COUNTY,
Thursday, April 30, 1863

I am Provost Marshal of this city, and have a great amount of labor to do. No one can pass our lines without a pass from me, and no one can get a pass from me unless he takes the oath of allegiance. I administered the oath to thirty in less than three hours. I stopped all the mail going South, and will not let any more pass for the present. Oh! how I love to make the "Rebs" swear! You know how I like traitors, and you can judge how much sympathy

I show them! I shall arrest every man who talks treason, and send him to Headquarters. It would tickle you to see some of these "Rebs" choke when they swallow the oath, but it must go down. It will do them good! . . .

That the gentle Jennie at home was in hearty sympathy with her husband's fierce threats cannot be doubted after reading this extract:

May 6, 1863

"You write that you are now stationed at Columbia, and that you are Provost Marshal of that place. Is not that quite a responsible position? . . . I hope you will not show the least shadow of mercy to traitors; but caution is unnecessary. I fully understand your views. Please send me a copy of the 'pill' you are dosing them with. . . ."

Captain Burrows continues his detailed account of the performance of his duty:

OFFICE OF PROVOST MARSHAL,
COLUMBIA, *May 2, 1863*

My labors are great in my present position of Provost Marshal, but I like it very much. I have administered the oath to over 300, and not a man or woman can pass beyond our lines without taking it. One man here in town swore he would not take the oath. Yesterday morning, while his horse was

hitched at the door, some one came up and drove it off. It was necessary for him to go beyond the lines to get it. And, as a matter of course, he had to take the oath. It went down hard. The penalty for violating an oath is death. . . .

OFFICE OF PROVOST MARSHAL,
COLUMBIA, *May 10, 1863*

As we were marching through the town I received orders from Colonel Morrison, our Brigade Commander, to remain in the place and resume my duties as Provost Marshal. I took this as quite a compliment, and felt still more complimented after I learned that the citizens had petitioned the Colonel for my return. I have some warm friends here, among whom is Judge Bramlette, the Union nominee for Governor. He says the course I have pursued is just, and ought to have been adopted long before this. I think I told you in my last that I was not instructed to administer the oath of allegiance, but I wanted to do it, and not a man or woman can leave till the pill is taken. One man skulked out, and I am going to send for him in the morning. He has got to take it or "go up." . . . I send in this a copy of the oath. What do you think of it? Isn't it glorious? . . .

On May 2 and 3, 1863, General Hooker, who had succeeded General Burnside in command of the Army

of the Potomac, met Lee and Jackson at Chancellorsville, and was disastrously defeated. Gloom settled down upon the North, and the Union army itself found it difficult to conceal its despair. This letter is typical in its expression, frankly acknowledging the perilous situation but doggedly insisting upon ultimate success:

COLUMBIA, KENTUCKY,
May 17, 1863

You have learned of our defeat on the Rappahannock. My heart is discouraged. Hooker, on whom the people and the Army had placed their hopes, is out-generaled and ruined. To whom shall we look now? Hooker is not a general.

You ask me the cause of his defeat. I think it was nothing more than inability to command such an army. He was out-generaled, and Lee has shown himself to be the greatest spirit of the age. Hooker threw part of his army in the rear and part in front, thereby weakening his force and separating them beyond supporting distance. Lee hurls all his forces upon Hooker and routs him, and then, by a quick march, pounces upon Sedgwick, driving him across the river, almost annihilating him. Thus, with an inferior number, Lee defeats the Army of the Potomac. By latest accounts, Lee is moving upon Washington, and soon the Capital will again be in danger. I

would not be surprised if McClellan was again placed in command of the Army of the Potomac. You know I am not a McClellan man, but I have never doubted his military ability. The great difficulty with him is, he is too slow, too timid. He commenced a siege against Yorktown with 108,000 men when it was held by only 15,000 of the enemy, and whenever he meets the enemy he hesitates and pauses till the enemy gains a sufficient amount of strength to successfully resist or retreat. Were he not a timid man he would be the hero of the hour.

But it is idle to speculate upon his virtues. When the Nation is beggared, then, perhaps, Heaven will give us a man who can use the Nation's resources for our prosperity. Jennie, do not think by this letter that I am ready to surrender. Never! as long as I live! We shall conquer in the end. Do not be discouraged. We have everything to urge us onwards. If we are defeated, then war and devastation will sweep over this land until all is enveloped in a common ruin. . . .

OFFICE OF PROVOST MARSHAL,
COLUMBIA, *May 19, 1863*

Not having any more news to write, what shall I say? It is useless to tell you of my love for you and our little one. It is as pure as Heaven and as deep as the universe. You know it all. How happy we

shall be when this cruel war is brought to a close, and we, in our own dear home, can partake of its home joys, which fill the heart with wild delight. Heaven speed that hour! . . .

Burrows found it more and more difficult to keep up with the army requirements because of his weakened physical condition; for he had never regained his strength after the strenuous days of South Mountain and Antietam. Just when it seemed inevitable that he would be obliged to return home, the way opened for him to continue in service:

OFFICE OF PROVOST MARSHAL,

COLUMBIA, *May 28, 1863*

General Welch is here in command. He is the Commander of the First Division. He reached here day before yesterday. He is a splendid man. Although Belcher was Brigade Provost Marshal, yet I have done so well that I shall continue in my present position by order of General Welch. . . .

It almost kills me to march. Tomorrow morning I ride, as the Colonel is going to Lebanon, and I will act as Lieutenant-Colonel on the march. I went up to General Welch's Headquarters this morning—like him very much. Colonel Luce told him that I could not walk, and that I thought of resigning. The General said, "Do not resign, and I will get you a position as a staff officer." . . .

This new appointment separated Captain Burrows from his comrades of the Seventeenth Michigan, which was a real regret; but it had its compensations. He hastens to reassure the anxious heart of the waiting wife at home by his picture of his changed surroundings:

HEADQUARTERS FIRST DIVISION, G.A.C.

VICKSBURG, *Monday, June 22, 1863*

This evening finds me in my tent at the Headquarters of General Welch, in excellent health and the best of spirits. You cannot imagine how much easier I am going to have it here than I did with my company. If course I regret to leave the shattered remnant of that noble band of boys who have stood beside me in so many well-fought battles, who bear upon their breasts the scars of South Mountain, Antietam, and Fredericksburg; with whom I have shared the privations of the camp and the hardships of the march, and gathered with them around the lonely grave of some fallen comrade, weeping over his early end. Yet, in such a cause as this our private feelings must give way to the public interest, and our hearts for the time being must be wedded to the public good. While with them I feel that I have done my duty to them and my country, and if the star of duty calls me to another field of action I must follow in its light. My ambition knows no bounds

in such a contest as this, where the fate of a Republic, the happiness of my family, and the hopes of the world are all involved in the issues of the mighty present. The deep-seated affections of the human heart cannot be outrooted, neither must our country be forgotten.

But I was going to tell you how much easier I will have it here than in my company. In the regiment all officers have been reduced in baggage to a very small amount, and were deprived of wall tents, compelled to use the shelter tents, and besides all this must endure the tedious march. Here I have my wall tent, with some one to put it up for me. My table, chairs, and desk furnished, a horse and trappings furnished by the Government, so that all expected expense is done away with. Isn't it glorious! Now, Jennie, you have not half the reason to worry about me that you had before. . . .

There is no mention in the letters which exist of the battle of Jackson, which was fought on July 11, 1863, but G.A.R. Commander Samuel J. Lawrence has recorded this story of Captain Burrows' gallantry in action:

"The late General William Shakespeare," he relates, "had been shot down and left upon the field. When Captain Burrows missed him, he rushed back

to rescue him. Reaching the wounded officer, Burrows insisted on carrying him off the field, although the General ordered him to leave him there to die. Bullets were humming like bees, and it seemed impossible for a man to live in such a fire, but Burrows got through and brought the General with him."

As an officer, Burrows demonstrated his leadership as he afterwards showed it in his statesmanship. "He was the coolest man," said William Winegar of Grand Rapids, a member of his company, "and one of the bravest I ever saw in battle. He was an inspiration to all of us, and was beloved by his comrades as almost no other man was beloved."

The stubbornness with which the people in the eastern third of the State of Tennessee refused all overtures to join the Confederacy made them the mark for vicious reprisals. Burrows' regiment was a part of the Union forces sent to the border for their protection. The acts of wanton cruelty practiced upon these non-combatants inflamed his hatred for the Rebels, and erroneously confirmed his belief that the war itself, from a Southern standpoint, was being conducted upon these inhuman lines. He pours out his indignation to the wife at home:

COLUMBIA, KENTUCKY,

Friday Afternoon, May 22, 1863

. . . . You say, speaking of the privilege denied

us of speaking face to face, that in these war times “we must accustom ourselves to self-denials.” No doubt but that I am missed in the home circle; no doubt but that had your pillow a tongue it would tell a tale of sleepless nights and troubled visions; no doubt but that the struggle at parting with my wife and child was heart-rending; no doubt but that the vision of our happy home, forsaken for our country, will be forever impressed upon our memory; no doubt but that we spend many a lonely hour thinking of joys forsaken, and fearing that perhaps they may never again be realized,—yet all this pain and suffering which we are enduring for the good of our common mother country is but a drop to the wild ocean of grief and wretchedness which has engulfed East Tennessee, and whose mad waves are now lashing at the shores of the border States, and threaten to overwhelm them and us in a common ruin.

Here neither life, liberty, nor property is secure. Bands of lawless robbers and murderers infest even valleys and mountains, licensed to plunder and lay waste the whole land until desolation and ruin shall reign supreme. The protest of the father, the entreaties of the mother, the pleadings of helpless infancy are alike inadequate to move to pity their icy hearts. Treason has taken possession of their lives, and he who has deliberately entered upon a plan for

destroying this Government is ready to play a part in any tragedy however dark and bloody. Indeed, common vices whiten into seeming virtues. . . . We sacrifice much, endure much, but are you not willing to bear all until these wrongs are righted, and these monsters in human shape are hunted from the face of this fair earth? Never will I, for one, like a dastard coward, surrender to these outlaws, and let them hunt from my home the wife and child for whom I have given up my life to protect and defend. To do it will be treason supreme.

Then, Jennie, when you are suffering and agonizing for me far away, think of the thousand bleeding hearts we are struggling to bind up, and let it nerve you to endure your hardships, and let it arouse all that is womanly in your noble nature. You say that you do not believe but that those wives who send their husbands so freely to the war do it from other motives than patriotism. I agree with you fully. I would not have you say to me, "Go to war"; it would argue a lack of that love upon which the soul lives and dotes. . . .

OFFICE OF PROVOST MARSHAL,
COLUMBIA, *August 21, 1863*

The citizens are flocking here in great numbers daily, bringing their property—all that is movable. The "Rebs" cross every night in small numbers, and

plunder and rob the people. I do not know why our cavalry is not sent out and these outlaws driven across the river. I understand it is to be done. This can be done only by cavalry and, of course, the infantry will remain at this point. I pity the people of Clinton and Russell counties. They have been driven from their homes, and their wives and children have been forced to take shelter in the caves and fastnesses of their mountains. Men have come to me here, bringing with them what little property they could carry, and have shed tears like girls when they were relating the story of their wrongs, and remembered the dear ones they left behind. . . . Here the father sleeps with his rifle under his pillow; the mother drops a bitter tear over the cradle of her child as she presses upon its untaught lips the token of a mother's love, and all retire to sleep—perhaps the sleep of death. This agony of suspense is terrible. How happy I shall be when the G. A. C. with its brave thousands shall speak with the cannon and sword to the oppressed of that land, and the father can once more embrace wife and child under the starry flag of our rescued country. That time is not far distant. Heaven speed it!

We get the news every day by telegraph. It looks encouraging just now. The reverse of Hooker is nothing. We injured the "Rebs" more than they

injured us.¹ The war will end in 1864—you see if I am not right. Three places are to be taken, three battles are to be fought, and the old flag will be reinstated throughout our broad domain. Hooker, Rosecrans, and Grant must triumph, and the rotten Confederacy fall. The day's report brings us the news that Grant has taken Jackson, Mississippi, and burned it. If this be true, the railroads are cut off, and Vicksburg and Port Hudson must fall. Indeed it is rumored that Vicksburg is evacuated. I think it more than probable. Tomorrow we shall hear something more. I hope its confirmation. . . .

It was at Blue Springs, Tennessee, that Captain Burrows fought his last battle in company with the Seventeenth Michigan.² After the months spent in

¹The victory cost the Confederates the life of Stonewall Jackson, who was shot through mistake by his own pickets as he returned from a reconnoissance.

²The history of the Seventeenth Michigan from this point should be recorded: After General Longstreet marched into Eastern Tennessee, the Seventeenth followed him and occupied several positions, marching continuously, destitute of supplies, and depending wholly for their scanty rations upon the country through which they passed. They suffered much also from the sleet and snow, against which their threadbare uniforms offered little protection. On March 22, 1864, the regiment began its return march of nearly two hundred miles across the Cumberland Mountains to Nicholasville, Kentucky, where it received orders to proceed to Annapolis, Maryland, to join the Army of the Potomac. On May 6, 1864, it was engaged in the desperate battle of the Wilderness, and in a daring charge upon the enemy's works, the Seventeenth was surrounded in the dense woods by the heavy lines of the Confederates and almost annihilated. As a result, the regiment practically lost its position in the brigade for want of numbers, and

Eastern Tennessee, the regiment was sent to Lenoir Station to contest the advance of General Longstreet's troops. As the Union forces fell slowly back upon Knoxville, the Seventeenth acted as rear guard, and fought a severe engagement with Longstreet's force. In this letter to his wife Burrows gives a vivid description of that portion of the battle in which he personally took part:

HEADQUARTERS, FIRST DIVISION, NINTH ARMY CORPS,

Camp at KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE,

Friday, October 16, 1863

I have not written you since a week ago today. The fault is none of mine—circumstances control us all. When I wrote you last Friday I used a little deception—my old trick, you know; but you will pardon it when you remember the motive. You know I would not cause you one unnecessary sorrow. I told you in my last not to worry about me if you did not get a letter for a week or ten days, as the mails were liable to be cut off. I knew I could not write you again for some time, but I thought it not prudent then to give you the reason, as it would but pain you without assisting me. But to the facts. When I wrote you my last we were under marching orders, the survivors served with the army in various positions assigned them, taking part in the assault before Petersburg. After Lee's surrender, the Seventeenth embarked at City Point for Alexandria, Virginia, and participated in the grand review at Washington on May 23, 1865.

and the majority of our troops had already moved. For some time the Rebel force had been collecting in the extreme portion of Eastern Tennessee, with the intention of attacking Burnside and driving him from Knoxville and Tennessee. This army was already in motion, and had nearly reached Morristown, when Burnside ordered the army to meet the exultant foe. On Thursday, the 8th, the cars were loaded with troops, and rolling up toward Morristown. General Willcox was already there with 5,000 troops, and the Ninth Army Corps, together with General Shackelford's Cavalry, were on the move. Friday noon, October 9th, the last train of troops left Knoxville. On this train were Major-Generals Burnside and Parke and staffs, and Brigadier-Generals Ferrero, Potter, and Shackelford, and staffs—all in one car. At every station crowds of citizens gathered around the train and welcomed the Generals with deafening cheers. The starry flag of our country waved from almost every housetop, and our trip seemed more like a pleasure ride than a march to a battlefield. The loyalty of these much-abused American citizens is growing stronger and stronger every day, and the people are flocking to their country's standard by thousands. East Tennessee is delivered from the tyrant's rule, and the loved flag of the Republic kisses the mountain breeze. On Friday, the cars ran

beyond Morristown to a place called Bull's Gap, where we disembarked about nine o'clock at night. Above this point the Rebels held the railroad. After a good night's rest we continued our march, starting Saturday morning at six o'clock. The cavalry in the morning had engaged the enemy, who had taken up a strong position at a place called Blue Springs. They were unable to advance. We reached the scene of action at ten o'clock. From that time until three in the afternoon Colonel Carter was endeavoring to find out the position of the enemy, and the crack of musketry and the thunder of artillery rolled along the hill. Still, no headway was made. At three o'clock P. M., General Ferrero asked General Burnside to allow him to attack the enemy. It was at once granted. The First Division of the Ninth Army Corps was immediately set in motion. The line of battle was formed, the cannon were planted, and all things ready for the coming engagement. Soon the ball opened. The mountain shook with the thunder of our guns, the stretchers were bearing off the wounded, and all the terrors of the battle were upon us. Our Division alone drove the enemy for more than a mile, and would have captured his guns had not darkness overtaken us. When the firing ceased we were under the very muzzles of their guns. But night stopped the struggle, and the victory was ours.

General Ferrero is a perfect Napoleon. We all were in the thickest of the fight, and never since the battle of South Mountain have I been where shot and shell flew thicker. The General is perfectly reckless of danger—courting it as if it were a thing to be loved. Just at night I rode back to order up a battery, and as I was passing through the ranks of the Michigan Twentieth a cannon ball struck in the regiment, wounding three and killing one. As I rode up a road a shell burst over my head, the fragments flying all around me, and while we were driving the enemy a shell burst so near me that I felt the motion of the air, and saw the flash of light. The action was terrific for the time being, but, as fortune would have it, I escaped without a scratch. This is my sixth engagement. Haven't I been fortunate? Heaven be thanked! We lost in this action about sixty in killed and wounded. The killed and wounded of the enemy outnumbered our own.

That night we slept without tents with the cloudless canopy of Heaven for our covering, and dreamed of our homes and loved ones far away. Sabbath morning, at daylight, our skirmishers advanced, but soon ascertained that the enemy had flown. Immediately the army was in motion. The foaming cavalry dashed by, the artillery rolled rapidly onward, and the soldiers, eager to capture the foe, pressed

forward with unbounded eagerness. We were sure of capturing the enemy. Colonel Foster had been sent to head off their retreat, and had succeeded in gaining their rear. Escape was impossible. But just as we were attacking their rear Foster became frightened (or else he is treacherous), skulked behind a mountain, and let the enemy escape. It was a crying shame! The cavalry pursued them, the infantry encamped. The contest was over. Had Foster done his duty we should have captured 5,000 prisoners, but it is just our luck! Treachery and imbecility have almost ruined us, but our cavalry will pursue the enemy and capture many prisoners, and drive the last armed traitor from the borders of Tennessee.

Monday we rested. Tuesday morning we commenced our march back to Knoxville. The troops went on the cars. The train with the artillery took the road and went with them, they being placed under my command. Tuesday night we encamped at Blue Springs, the battlefield. Wednesday night encamped at Panther Springs, and last night reached our old quarters here in Knoxville, all safe and sound and well.

So you have a history of this brief campaign. Now you are glad, I know, that I did not tell you of this before it happened, as you would have worried continually. Pardon the deception. . . .

Although Captain Burrows escaped "without a scratch," this last conflict with the enemy proved conclusively that he was physically unfit for further active service. More than this, the campaign for Lincoln's second election was in sight, and his friends in the army and at home persuaded him that he could contribute more to the cause to which he had devoted himself with his voice than by continuing his service in the field. So he writes home:

October 16, 1863

I expect to start for Unionville Tuesday or Wednesday. You will see me at the depot some time week after next. I will write you as soon as my resignation is accepted, and tell you when I start. It will take me a week to go home. I will soon be with you. Tell little Meda Papa is coming home. . . .

While "Papa is coming home" let us piece together the story of the pain and the heartache and the anxiety which had been slowly consuming the patient Jennie, while her husband was performing his part in the great struggle to preserve the Union and to defend the Home. As she so frankly says, there is "nothing to write about." Nothing, except of herself and of the little daughter in which the life of both was centered!

"People tell me that I have changed somewhat,"

she writes with unconscious pathos, "and that I look a few years older than when you went away, and yet I think I am stronger and can endure more than I used to. Ma tells me I will look so worn and used up generally that you will be ashamed of me when you come home. But I think I shall succeed in preserving my identity. You will at least find the same heart. . . . I presume you have noticed that I do not write as long letters lately; it is because it makes my side ache."

Read these disconnected extracts from the letters which contained "nothing," and in them read the story of thousands of women of these paralyzing years. Read in them the patient loyalty, the inspiring confidence, the unwavering devotion, which gave to the husbands and the sons the power to preserve the Union:

"You don't know how I miss you, Cæsar. The longer you are gone the more utter my loneliness is. I miss your rich, strong, sympathetic nature. My very being has become identified with you. But you are in the way of duty, and I must be content. Our suffering country needs just such brave, noble spirits to defend her injured rights, although my life (and thousands of others) be drained of every joy. . . ."

"In your last letter you seem discouraged on account of the inactivity of the army. You must be patriotic indeed if you can urge an advance under the

present state of weather and roads. . . . I don't think I shall ever murmur or complain again, for even when I am sick I am still more comfortable than you. . . .”

“You want me to give you the exact condition of my own health. Well, I have occasional sick spells (they usually occur after battles or periods of more than ordinary concern), but on the whole my health is very good. . . . For a week past I have been subject to a sort of miserable indifference. I think it was the reaction consequent upon a state of intense excitement and solicitude on your account.

“How did you spend your Christmas yesterday? Meda hung up her stocking and got it full. Ma put in a new red apron, and Nettie put in candy and raisins, and the most perfect little gilt china pitcher you ever saw. She was perfectly carried away with it. When she first saw it she said, ‘Now I wish I could show this to Papa.’ In the morning I heard some one talking in the dining-room. I looked in and there stood Meda, up in a chair before your likeness, throwing kisses at you and saying, ‘I wish you a Merry Christmas, Papa dear.’ . . .

“The old year, so heavily laden with great events, has gone down into the tomb of the past. It was a mighty swell upon the sea of time, but it is now broken upon the shore. The dark account of the

past twelve months will form an important feature in our historic record. The twilight which attended the birth of the old year has deepened into black darkness. Aside from our National calamities and sad disasters and reverses to our armies, there are unwritten volumes of misery and anguish, known only to the heart of the stricken sufferer. Think of the ruined households and broken home circles where joy and gladness reigned but one short year ago. . . .

“May the New Year be unlike the old. May she teem with victories of right over wrong, freedom over slavery; may liberal, just, and democratic views (no reference to modern Democracy!) triumph over mercenary and despotic sentiment. Heaven grant that the coming year may not chronicle the date of a ruined Nation! . . . You ask me if I do not love to think of our future home. Oh! Cæsar, if it were not for thoughts of the future I could not endure the present. . . . I do not wish to see our country suffer any further dishonor, but if anything like an honorable compromise can be effected I should be in favor of it. . . .”

Writing to him while he is still at Seminary Hospital she says: “Don’t get well too fast for I am afraid you will have to go back to the regiment. I know you will think this is not very honorable advice, but I cannot help it. . . .”

"My eyes feel unusually bad this evening. Can you guess what ails them? . . . There has been an unusual amount of rascality going on lately. Every paper has its list of robberies,—soldiers especially are victims; so, my dear, you must be on your guard when coming home."

"Cæsar, the State of Ohio has gone Democratic,—isn't it a burning shame? . . . Oh! my Cæsar, can it be that you must engage in another murderous conflict. . . . I have adopted the plan of living only one day at a time, and find that quite as much as I am adequate to."

"I have packed in the valise one can of cherries, one of raspberries, some dried peaches, a few dried cherries, some dried halibut (don't know how to spell it), a little speck of maple sugar, a little piece of cheese, some dried corn, two pair of woollen socks, and a bottle of whiskey. Vess¹ told me to send it, and I need not caution you to use it judiciously."

"You must be very careful what you say against General McClellan. I am afraid you will say more than will be prudent. You know my motive is good in warning you."

"I did not sleep much last night, for it was bitter cold. I cannot rest when I know that you must be suffering. . . . You do not know how worried Meda

¹ Sylvester Solomon Burrows.

is for you. She seems to perfectly realize your condition. Last night, after we got to bed, she commenced laughing very heartily. I asked her what pleased her, and she said, 'I was thinking how glad we would be if my dear Papa would come right into our room now.' I thought so too. . . . I could not live if I thought I never should see you again. . . ."

The prayers availed, and the reunion became a reality. The "little home," so many times referred to, toward which they both had planned, and for which they had toiled and sacrificed, was purchased in Kalamazoo in November, 1863. But even the joy of realization was not enough to give back to the frail body what the constant strain had taken from it, and in August of the following year Jennie passed away to that rich reward which belongs to those who unhesitatingly give of themselves to those they love:

*"'Mid the flower-wreathed tombs I stand,
Bearing lilies in my hand.
Comrades! in what soldier grave
Sleeps the bravest of the brave?"*

.

*"One low grave, the trees beneath,
Bears no garland, wears no wreath,
Yet no heart more high and warm
Ever dared the battle-storm.*

.

*“Turning from my comrades’ eyes,
Kneeling where a woman lies,
I strew lilies on the grave
Of the bravest of the brave.”*¹

¹ Thomas Wentworth Higginson.

CHAPTER IV

PERSONAL RECONSTRUCTION. 1864-1872

AS Burrows relates in the last chapter, he had taken part in six actual engagements,—South Mountain, Maryland, September 14, 1862; Antietam, Maryland, September 17, 1862; Fredericksburg, Virginia, December 13, 1862; the siege of Vicksburg, June 17 to July 4, 1863; Jackson, Mississippi, July 11, 1863; and Blue Springs, Tennessee, October 10, 1863. Besides this, he took part in the East Tennessee Campaign from August 16 to October 19, 1863, the date of his honorable discharge on resignation.

The return home meant a complete readjustment. During the period of his service in the army the country itself had undergone a drastic reorganization, and the conditions in Kalamazoo were to be learned anew. Friends and comrades were dead or still at the front, the results of the terrible strain upon the people were everywhere apparent, his duties to his family, his associates, and himself were complicated and uncertain,—yet he plunged into the work as he saw it to

be done. In helping to solve the problem of the community he succeeded in solving his own.

The return home served to change his attitude toward the President from that of merely partisan support to an understanding appreciation of the obstacles against which Lincoln had contended and the difficulties he still had to surmount. The viewpoint of the citizen at home was far different from that of the soldier at the front. To have misjudged any man meant to Burrows immediate acknowledgment and restitution; to have misjudged Lincoln meant a life's devotion when the scales once fell from his eyes. Into the Presidential canvass Burrows threw his whole soul, and his expressions were so sincere and heartfelt that they could not fail to be effective.

The political situation during the early days of Lincoln's second campaign was full of anxiety and contained many unestimable factors. Grant's desperate fighting in Virginia kept the North depressed and apprehensive, for his movement upon Petersburg had as yet produced no decisive results.¹ Sherman's campaign in Georgia at that time gave no promise that its outcome was to be so brilliant, and the raids

¹ "Grant ordered a general attack on Petersburg this morning at daybreak. Everything was behind. Did not begin till an hour after daylight. Hancock did not get over till after daylight, and the cavalry not at all. Burnside exploded his mine under the enemy's works, and

made by the Rebels into Maryland and Pennsylvania gave weight to the contention of the Democrats that the war was a failure.

McClellan was nominated by the Democrats at Chicago on August 29, 1864, only a little more than two months before the election. Vallandigham wrote into the platform the plank upon which the Peace advocates based their hopes: "After four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war, during which . . . the Constitution itself has been disregarded in every part," public welfare demands "that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities." Chase had resigned his portfolio in Lincoln's Cabinet, and a certain disintegration appeared to be in progress even among the Administration forces. "It seems as if there were appearing in the Republican Party the elements of disorganization which destroyed the Whigs," wrote John Hay on August 25, 1864, to his friend Nicolay. "If the dumb cattle are not worthy of another term of Lincoln, then let the will of God be done, and the murrain of McClellan fall on them."

As the campaign progressed, Fate took a hand in the canvass, and Lincoln's chances of reëlection were our men marched up to the crest without opposition, and then *halted*. What in the name of halting and delays they are doing now I do not know. I am disgusted!" [Unpublished letter from General B. F. Butler to Mrs. Butler, 30 July, 1864.]

vastly improved. Farragut won the victory of Mobile Bay, Sherman forced Hood to evacuate Atlanta, and the success of the Union arms began to seem assured. "Every shell from Sheridan's guns knocks a plank from the Chicago platform," cried Burrows in one of his impassioned campaign speeches. "Go to the gallant Farragut, who, lashed to the mast amid a storm of leaden hail, went on to victory, and ask him if the war is a failure; go to Sherman, who steadily advanced the old flag until he planted it on the principal stronghold in Georgia, and ask him if the war is a failure; go to Grant, who is cutting every artery of the Rebellion, and ask if the war is a failure; go to the gallant Sheridan, whose gleaming bayonets sent the Rebel hordes like a whirlwind up the Valley, and ask him if the war is a failure. Go ask your 'deluded brother' Early, whose army was driven in squads to the mountains, if the war is a failure. . . . The great battle of the Republic is to be fought at the ballot-box. It is for us to say whether the war is to go on, or whether we shall bring back that gallant army with their cheeks mantled with the blush of shame. Let us send to the army a victory that it can carry to the enemy on the point of the bayonet."

An interesting pen-picture of the youthful orator in this campaign is given us by the Very Reverend Father O'Brien of Kalamazoo:

"We had heard much of young Burrows as a public speaker," he relates, "and had followed his achievements in the army during the Civil War; but our first ¹ meeting was in Monroe, my old home, in the Fall of 1864. It was during President Lincoln's second campaign that he was announced as the leading speaker at one of the old-fashioned mass meetings. Monroe County had always been Democratic. Burrows' fame as a vote-maker preceded him, and the Democratic Party, in order to offset the affair, determined to have the greatest meeting of the year on the same day. Having control of the county, they managed to secure the public square adjoining the court-house, where all such meetings were held. There came near being a clash. The Republicans had come from every quarter of the county. They assembled in the square adjoining the old Episcopal church, where the hotel now stands, which is diagonally across from the court-house square. Bands attempted to drown the speakers alternately.

"Word came that Burrows' train was delayed. The Democrats apparently seemed to have won the day, and a lot of disheartened members of the new Party awaited the arrival of the train. About half

¹ Father O'Brien followed Burrows' career from this point for many years with deep personal interest and friendship, and did much to win Catholic support for him in his political campaigns.

past four it backed down the track from Petersburg, the Lake Shore Railroad running through the center of the city. Courage came to the Republicans with the sight of the train, and the loiterers became very active. The distinguished speaker disembarked, and was escorted amid cheers to the steps of the church. Then the battle began. The Democratic Party attempted to keep the crowd and drown the speaker's voice, but it was no use. That magnificent voice of those days resounded above the din of cheers and the noise of the band, and it was not long before the Democratic speaker found himself surrounded by scarcely a dozen. The whole crowd had flocked over to hear the brilliant young orator.

"It was a very warm afternoon. In the midst of his speech, Burrows took off his coat, remarking that the 'zeal of the cause had so enthused him that he desired to be unhampered in his onslaught of the Democrats, as he intended to make it as hot as eternal perdition for all the enemies of Lincoln.' This was a 'stunt' unknown in those days in that section, and if he ever scored a success it was at that time. The crowd went wild with enthusiasm, and it was some moments before he could continue. 'He came, he spoke, he conquered.' No man ever scored a greater victory. Well do we remember the old farmers' antics of joy, tossing up their hats and jumping about

the ground as he finished his discourse. It was with great difficulty that he succeeded in getting back to the car. He had to 'shake' with every one, and although the whistle kept tooting and the bell a-ringing, yet they desired to hold him. Finally he boarded the rear platform of the coach, and was forced to make another five-minute speech. It was with difficulty that the train got through the mass of humanity that hung around that car. Burrows became our idol from that day, and has been such ever since."

Lincoln was reëlected, and delivered his second inaugural on March 4, 1865. Only a little more than a month later Lincoln lay dead, and the country sobbed over his bier. When the people of Kalamazoo, in common with the sorrowing multitudes throughout the Nation, wished to make public demonstration of their grief, it was to Burrows—veteran soldier and seasoned patriot at the age of twenty-eight!—that they turned for spokesman. These extracts are given not only as a link in the National story which runs through these pages, but also as an early example of the man's oratorical powers. In this Eulogy, delivered on June 1, 1865, Burrows says in part:

"The fourteenth day of April, eighteen hundred and sixty-five, is a day ever to be remembered, not

only in the history of our own country but in the annals of the whole civilized world. It will stand firm and erect amid the leaning ruins of time, and fling its gloomy shadow far down the untrodden pathway of the ages. It was a day of National exultation. The morning sun was hailed with the thundering of cannon, the waving of banners, and the echoing and re-echoing shouts of rejoicing millions. A new-born halo of light blazed around our starlit flag, beneath which illumination every loyal American citizen from ocean to ocean, from lake to gulf, was walking in the consciousness of a just pride. The trained armies of the Rebellion, with their acknowledged Chieftain, which for more than four years had resisted the authority of the Government and defied its power, were reeling backward, broken and overthrown, and kneeling for mercy at our feet. Their defiant cities, with their almost impregnable fortified capital, resounded with the tread of our conquering legions and the melody of our National airs. Maid and matron, with light heart and joyous song, were weaving garlands of triumph to pave the pathway of our returning heroes. The representative heads of this foul conspiracy were flying in ignominious haste over the ruins of their desolate homes, and from beneath the tottering pillars of the Confederacy. Over the land and over the sea, up from the triumphant army and

navy, came the glad shout of victory, which waiting millions caught and echoed back from the hills of New England to the sea-girt shores of the distant West. The National ensign, that emblem of our pride and prowess, which four years before went down over shattered Sumter amid the howlings of treason, was again floating in triumph above the altar where it first fell. A Nation rose up to give it greeting. Redeemed and disenthralled humanity with tears of gratitude gazed upon its stars of hope. The heavy clouds of war were breaking away upon the National horizon, and the sunlight of returning peace was playing at the portals of the Republic.

“Night closed upon this great day of National jubilee. A sense of public and personal security pervaded every breast within our borders; but ere the last sounds of National rejoicing had died away upon our ears, while the pulse was yet throbbing with a high enthusiasm, the wild cry of assassination rang upon the startled air, and Abraham Lincoln, whose name was upon every tongue, lay with gaping wounds bleeding and dying in the National capital. At the very moment when treason was sinking to its unholy tomb—when we thought it beyond even the attempt at resistance,—in its very death agony,—it lifted its blood-clotted hand, and, reaching backward beyond the wall of bayonets that hemmed it in, struck down

the Nation's idol, and fell back to its grave hissing, 'The South is avenged!' The blow was given not for victory, or in the hope of National triumph, but in the fell spirit of a merciless revenge,—the fit culminating act of rebellious, bloody tragedy.

"A sob of National sorrow went moaning over the land. The sad intelligence was borne on the wings of lightning to every home and every heart. The stoutest were overwhelmed and appalled. Men forgot their accustomed duties. We tremblingly took each other by the hand, and with tearful eye, pallid cheek, and quivering lip, attempted the story of our grief, but turned away—silent, speechless, mute. The drapery of sorrow shrouded every home. The National ensign hung low, burdened with the symbol of its grief. Credulity staggered at the thought of such a bloody deed. We would not believe that he who had guided us with such fidelity through these dark days, that he in whom the affections of the American people were centered, who was just reaching to grasp the goal for which he had struggled, had fallen. . . .

"It is an established fact of history that the fearful contest in which we have been engaged, and from which we are just emerging, has been a struggle between constitutional liberty and constitutional tyranny. Between freedom and oppression. Upon

the one hand has been arrayed the stalwart millions of the free North, whose shield was the Constitution, whose helmet was the flag of our fathers, and whose battle cry was 'Liberty and Union.' Upon the other hand were those who had supplanted that Constitution and that flag, and would erect the ill-shaped fabric of an aristocratic government upon their sacred ruins. From the foundation of the Government there has been an uninterrupted contest between freedom and slavery, between right and wrong. All the power of legislative wisdom has been exhausted to chain these opposing elements. But they were such implacable foes, so diametrically opposed that they cannot be controlled, they cannot breathe the same free air, they cannot sleep under the shadow of the same star-lit flag. When Liberty raised its sacred voice in the council chambers of the Nation, Slavery's bludgeon silenced it. When Freedom flung her mantle around an infant Territory, the germ of sleeping empire, the vulture Slavery shrieked, hawked at her garments, and dabbled them with blood. Such was the fearful contest until it culminated in open civil war. No sooner had Abraham Lincoln assumed the reins of Government than he was beset by two factions who urged upon him the adoption of entirely different policies. The one, composed of those who regarded the law of slavery as paramount to the

Constitution, and the rights of slavery as the most sacred of all the rights which are guaranteed by that instrument, would denounce Mr. Lincoln if he interfered with slavery in any way, for any purpose, or at any time. The other, composed of those who regarded the abolition of slavery as the one great thing to be accomplished whatever else might be lost, would denounce him with equal bitterness that he did not sweep it out of existence the moment Fort Sumter was attacked. How firmly he stood amid these opposing factions, yielding to neither. And how history will applaud him for it. To have adopted the policy of the former would have insured the success of the Rebellion. To have chosen the course marked out by the latter would have been National suicide. . . .

“After almost two years of terrible war—two years of defeat and disaster—the prejudice of the American people was in a great measure overthrown, and we became convinced that the Rebellion could not be subdued while we held up its hands with the support of its four millions of serfs. That slavery or freedom must die. How unhesitatingly and boldly Abraham Lincoln chose his course . . . and having determined upon it, ‘he moved forward without fear, and with a manly heart.’ On the 22d of September, 1862, Abraham Lincoln, by proclamation, declared, ‘That on the first day of January, in the year of our

Lord 1863, all persons held as slaves within any State, or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free.' It was the first breathings of liberty that had ever rung in the ear of our downtrodden millions. For three-quarters of a century they had gazed upon our flag, the symbol of freedom to all but to them. It hung over them like the arching of a dungeon,—its broad stripes were bands of iron, its stars were bolts of steel. Now, for the first time, it meant liberty to them. The issuing of this proclamation created the intensest excitement throughout our own country, and engaged the attention of the whole civilized world. The oppressed everywhere clapped their manacled hands, while tyrants trembled in their kingly garbs. The National sky hung with an unwonted blackness. The surges of opposition rolled mountain high and thundered against the floundering Ship of State. Threatened mutiny raised its bloody hand until even the friends of the measure were terrified, and doubted whether the President would have the courage to redeem his pledge. How little they knew of the spirit of our Executive!"

Burrows found his legal practice largely increased by the conditions of the times. He felt the responsibility still of continuing his services in clinching the

victory practically won, but now by logic rather than by the sword. In 1864 he was elected to his first public office, that of Circuit Court Commissioner of Kalamazoo County. He became Prosecuting Attorney of the same county in 1866, and was reëlected in 1868, but resigned before his second term was completed. He was an unsuccessful candidate for the office of United States District Attorney for the Western District of Michigan, and in his thirtieth year he was appointed Supervisor of Internal Revenue for Michigan and Wisconsin, but declined that office.

In 1867 he made his first trip to England and to the Continent, and on his return formed a law partnership with Henry F. Severens, who later became United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan. The firm did a leading business in the courts of Southwest Michigan. Burrows excelled as an advocate, and was particularly strong in conducting the cross-examination of witnesses, while Severens was an able practitioner, deeply versed in legal principles, and an able counsellor. The partnership continued until Burrows was elected to Congress in 1872.

The European trip marks the break between Burrows' local and National public life. Only once, up to this time, had he delivered speeches outside of Michigan, but with the Grant and Colfax campaign

his horizon broadened, and his outlook became extended far beyond his own State.

With his mind so constantly centered upon National affairs, it was but natural that Burrows should early turn his face in the direction of Washington. The beginning of his political career, coming as it did immediately after the close of the war, gave him ample opportunity to make the most of his undoubted power of speech. It was a period when men were still controlled by the influences and effects of the long struggle, and Burrows, fresh from the battlefield, was able to feed their imagination with impassioned words which today sound overdrawn and oratorical, but which to his enthusiastic campaign audiences seemed inspired.

There is no question that even at this early stage of his career Burrows realized the value of his eloquence, and his power to sway men's judgment and to command their following. The rich wheat-growers in his immediate vicinity listened to his fervid words with approval, and saw in him a future statesman who could, at no distant date, represent their interests with satisfaction and with credit to his State. If this youthful orator could so affect their own emotions it was a self-evident proposition that his effect upon others, and in their behalf, would be identical.

The first testing out of Burrows' political wings came in 1870, in his thirty-third year, when he became a leading candidate for the Forty-second Congress, running against the seasoned veteran, General William L. Stoughton, who stood for reelection. Though busy with his law practice, Burrows had always taken an active part in local politics. It was his readiness to assist in the campaigns, and his growing reputation as an orator, that contributed to the crystallization of public sentiment in favor of his nomination as a candidate for Congress.

General Stoughton held Burrows' candidacy lightly at the beginning, but as the campaign proceeded he found him a somewhat dangerous competitor, and only succeeded in holding his seat after a valiant and creditable struggle. The Fourth Congressional District of Michigan has always been accounted one of the best and most intelligent in the country, and the voters were quick to appreciate the fervid imagination and the passionate enthusiasm which controlled Burrows from the beginning in his devotion to Republican principles.

The nature of the contest against Stoughton was such that although defeated the younger man's popularity was greatly increased. A letter published by Burrows during this campaign is an early example of his methods under fire:

KALAMAZOO, July 30, 1870

In view of the fact that my name is mentioned in connection with Representative in Congress from this District, and that a charge is made by one R. C. Nash against our present Representative that he received \$435 compensation for securing a place in the Government printing office for one Robinson, I desire to state, in justice to General Stoughton, that I am satisfied not only that the man Nash is utterly unworthy of belief, but that the charge is unwarranted from the evidence he produces. I make this statement in fairness to General Stoughton—being unwilling that my personal advancement should be promoted by the influence of any such false charge. . . .

His real opportunity came two years later, when he met his principal opponent, ex-lieutenant-Governor Charles S. May, in joint debate, and was successful in a contest over a man who, until Burrows became his rival, had been considered the greatest orator in that vicinity. May had done much for his Party, and was no less eager for Congressional honors than his young competitor, who now challenged him as the coming Representative of the District. After the longest convention contest on record, Burrows was nominated for the Forty-third Congress on the one hundred and fifty-second ballot, one hundred and

fifty-one ballots being taken without a single change in the votes.

His first campaign for himself came with the campaign of Grant for his second Presidential term. It was a period filled with vital interest and, from a political standpoint, definite discontent. The Republican predominance, which came with the successful outcome of the Civil War, while not yet endangered, had been weakened during Grant's first term as President by the alienation of influential men whose support it had previously commanded. The North by this time had come to realize that the policy of Thorough,¹ put forcibly into effect throughout the South during the reconstruction period by Thaddeus Stevens and his radicals, was not as beneficent or as unselfish as had been claimed, and that the South had a real right to its implacable enmity toward the Party which had administered affairs after the war. On the other hand, it was only too obvious that the conditions engendered by the misrule of the white men, by the arrogance of the carpet-baggers, and by the insolence of the negroes in the enjoyment of their new-found liberty, were such as still to demand firm and drastic handling if order was to be brought out of

¹ This word was first applied to the policy of Strafford and Laud, during the reign of Charles I, in England, of carrying through ("thorough") the administration of public affairs without regard to obstacles.

chaos. The conditions were to be deplored, it was true, and they were such as might easily have been avoided, but that they existed no one could dispute. The South in its desperation was meeting injustice with injustice, crime with crime, and horror with horror.

In 1870, an Act passed Congress placing Southern elections and the registration of voters in the Southern States under the virtual control of Federal supervisors and marshals, who were given power to protect voters in exercising their right of suffrage, and whose complaints were to be settled by the Circuit Courts of the United States instead of by the State Courts. The following year this Act was made stronger by extending to these Federal supervisors and marshals the power to protect every privilege which had been conferred upon the negro. Another Act was passed in this same session of the Forty-second Congress aimed at the crushing of the Ku-Klux Klan, treating this and other secret societies of the South as conspirators against the Government of the United States, and imposing penalties of heavy fines and imprisonment. President Grant was authorized to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* "during the continuance of such rebellion against the United States" whenever and wherever it seemed necessary to accomplish the purpose of the Act, and the Federal Courts were empow-

ered to exclude from juries all persons suspected of sympathizing with the members of these societies.

President Grant used these powers vigorously, beginning in South Carolina and extending throughout the South wherever the secret societies were to be found, and while these drastic measures succeeded in partially destroying the organized attempt to annul the rights of the negroes, it placed the people of the South at bay. Had President Grant been strong enough to stand out against politicians in selecting fit men for minor offices, and to ensure to them permanency of tenure, there would have been hope of success; but throughout his Administrations he showed himself incapable of judging men, and the country at large viewed with alarm the conditions as they existed.

As a result of all this there arose a definite opposition on the part of thoughtful men in the Republican Party to the Administration at Washington, but the first definite organization came from Missouri, where, in 1870, the so-called Liberal-Republican party was born, including such men as Carl Schurz, David A. Wells, Edward Atkinson, William Cullen Bryant, J. D. Cox, David Davis, Lyman Trumbull, Horace Greeley, Charles Francis Adams, ex-Governor Curtin of Pennsylvania, and ex-Governor Fenton of New

York. Less affected than the Democrats, but still sympathetic with the Southern situation, they further resented Grant's disregard for propriety and good taste, which they felt was destroying the dignity of the Presidency, and his inability to free himself from the control of unworthy advisers. They resented his weakness in the matter of Civil Service Reform and of tariff reduction, and looked upon his new policy of Force in the South as an unwarranted revival of issues which, for the good of the country as a whole, should be forgotten as speedily as possible.

The National Convention called by the Missouri Liberals met in Cincinnati on May 1, 1872, and amid high enthusiasm proceeded to nominate candidates for the National election. It was confidently expected that the selection of the Convention for the Presidency would be Charles Francis Adams, David Davis, or Lyman Trumbull, but when, on the sixth ballot, Horace Greeley was nominated, it became evident that their efforts had seriously miscarried. They had held no hope of electing a President at this first essay of their power, but they did expect to offer to the country a candidate of sagacity and political strength, and to take a definite step forward in forcing the issues of the war to be dropped. Greeley, however, was the last man to fit into this description. Hosts of Liberal-Republicans, who had been most

enthusiastic in the formation of the new Party, promptly renounced their allegiance, and the Northern Democrats found it impossible to support a candidate who so imperfectly represented all in which they believed. Were it not, then, that the Democratic Convention, which met at Baltimore in June, found itself obliged to accept the Liberal-Republican candidates and their platform, the contest would have become even more farcical than it was.

This was the political situation into which Burrows found himself injected, now with a personal interest in addition to his devotion to the Party which he had always served. Into it he threw himself heart and soul.

In the early part of the campaign Burrows formulated his political creed by which all his later actions must be judged. In one of his first speeches he declared: "I am proud to be numbered as one of the members of the great Republican Party, whose brilliant achievements, whose grand victories, have not only made it immortal, but have given to the Nation a reputation and a name as wide and as broad as civilization itself; and let me assure you that nothing of any private character; no personal grievance, however great; no personal matter, however it may wound my pride,—nothing shall ever drive me from the ranks of that grand old Party so long as it maintains

the splendid principles which it now advocates and has sustained in years past."

To Burrows, the Republican Party stood for the Union, and the Democratic Party for disunion. Grant was to him the saviour of his country, and to criticise him at all seemed to Burrows at that time evidence of the grossest ingratitude, and almost sacrilegious. What were minor errors of judgment, what were individual mistakes in act, compared with the great gift which Grant, the soldier, had given to his Nation! On the stump in this campaign (1872) Burrows gave a *résumé* of Republican achievements which are almost forgotten in considering the Republican Party as a Party today, except by those familiar with its history. They are worth recalling:

"Four years ago," Burrows said, "the great Republican Party of this country marshaled its forces for victory. It then had control of this Government. Years before it had planted itself upon the principle that all men were and ought to be free, and that the Territories of our domain in the future should be sacred to freedom. We nominated Abraham Lincoln as our standard bearer, and although we met with terrible opposition at the hands of the Democratic Party, yet the American people were successful in that issue, and by their ballots placed this Government in the hands of the Republican Party. The

Republican Party accepted the trust and entered upon the discharge of the duties devolving upon it.

“When Abraham Lincoln reached the Capital of the Nation he found the Democratic Party in power; he found a Democratic President who said that there was no power in the Constitution to coerce a State. He found, instead of one government, two governments; he found, instead of a united people, a divided Nation; he found seven States in open rebellion, organized against the common Government; the Union dissolved; our flag stricken down by those rebellious States, and a National government organized within our own borders. When the President delivered his inaugural address a rebel flag was floating in sight of the Capitol of this Republic, and a great Party said that we could not quell that Rebellion, that it was too powerful, and that we had no right under the Constitution to preserve ourselves. They said that the great Temple of Liberty was on fire and that we had no power to put it out. But we had a President and a Party which declared that it had the power to put it out, and, if it were necessary, to expend millions of treasure and put it out in rivers of blood.

“War came upon us, and for four years the Republican Party carried on that war. They carried it on amidst severest trials, they carried it on against fear-

ful odds; for it is a matter of history that not only did we fight the enemy in front upon a hundred bloody battlefields, but a Party at home at our firesides was constantly laboring day and night to assist the men who were seeking the overthrow of our armies and the destruction of our Government. They did all they could to discourage our soldiers, and finally, in convention in 1864 in Chicago, stated to the American people that the war was a failure; that our soldiers must lay down their arms in front of the rebels; that our gallant fleet must come back and anchor in Northern waters, and that the Rebellion must triumph.

“The great Republican Party met in its Convention bleeding at every pore by the fall of two hundred thousand of its noblest men. It solemnly declared that this war was not a failure, and that if it took every drop of blood in our veins, and every dollar from the National treasury, that rebellion must and should go down. We went onward, and in face of the violent opposition of the Democratic Party at home as well as upon the battlefield, and we carried the war forward until every armed foe had surrendered to General Grant.

“The war was over and we again elected Abraham Lincoln, but he fell by the hand of the assassin. Soon after this, Andrew Johnson, vice-President of the United States, betrayed the Party that elected

him; and then the Republican Party, rising above the man whom they had elected, and around whom they would naturally rally, said: 'You are betraying our principles, you are betraying the country and the flag; we ignore you and spew you out of our mouths as a reproach'; and that instant another Party picked him up. We had a Congress bold, firm, and resolute. The States that were in rebellion were disorganized and needed reconstructing. The great Republican Party said: 'We will reconstruct these States upon the basis of loyalty; we must reconstruct these States through the instrumentality of those men who have been true to the country,—true to the flag.' There was a Party in this land who, when the rebels had laid down their arms, took them by their blood-slippy fingers, and said: 'Under the Constitution and under the flag, strictly and legally, these men have a right, although their skirts are dripping with the blood of Union soldiers, to be lifted at once into political power.' The great Republican Party of this country said: 'No, never! We will reconstruct these States upon the basis of loyalty.' That was the spirit of the Republican Party.

"We sought to impeach Andrew Johnson for high crimes and misdemeanors, but a great Party rallied around, shielded, and protected him. In 1868, the great Republican Party organized and marshaled its

forces for a severe political contest, and were met by the great Democratic Party of the North, assisted by its Southern allies. We again laid down our platform of principles, broad and generous, and upon that platform nominated as our standard-bearer that man, the invincible hero of one hundred battlefields. Our victory was complete and overwhelming."

Turning to the Liberal-Republican-Democratic nominee, Burrows appealed to the apprehensions of the people that another rebellion might be in sight, and again played upon their patriotic loyalty to the army which had defended the Union. A contemporary newspaper report of one of his campaign speeches says: "The unapproachable climax to which he can carry the impulse of patriotism is beyond analysis and objection. The newness and originality of the substance of his discourse is upon every lip."

"I do not want Greeley for President," Burrows declared, "because I believe he is politically dishonest; because he is a secessionist. If Horace Greeley should, perchance, be elected President of the United States, I believe that before two years have passed away General Grant will be called upon to put down another rebellion. The followers of Horace Greeley at the South say the 'lost cause' is not lost, but that it will yet be revived and be successful. I

do not like the followers of Horace Greeley because they comprise the old rebel-Democratic Party.

“Austin Blair says we must not go about ‘rattling the dry bones of soldiers before the people.’ What say the fathers, mothers, sisters, and brothers of men who laid down their lives on Southern battlefields? Lyman Trumbull says we must ‘stop yelling about the horrors of Andersonville.’ What! must the mother whose son, shut up in that horrible pen and reduced to a living skeleton, crawled to the dead line, and, while reaching his bony fingers across it to pick up a crumb of bread, was shot like a dog,—must she forget the horrors of Andersonville?”

Burrows was always quick to take advantage of any opportunity for good-natured ridicule, and the coalition candidate offered his sense of humor an excellent opportunity for expression: “A number of very respectable men, and some not so respectable,” he explained, “assembled at Cincinnati in May to nominate a candidate for President. They did it, and when the child was born no one would admit its parentage. Schurz, Sumner, and others were called upon to look at the little one in its cradle, but they would not own it. They turned sadly away, one by one, and said, ‘It isn’t mine.’ It was a very sickly infant. There was no milk upon which to feed it until at length it

was brought to the breasts of the Democratic Party, and the command given, 'Now suck or die.' "

In another campaign speech he amused his audience by saying: "The position of the Liberal-Republicans is like the conduct of the steamboat captain who used a congregation, assembled to worship on his boat, to sink down one end of his craft so as to get the other end out of the mud. The Democratic craft is stuck in the mud, and the Liberal-Republicans are being used for the same purpose to which the steamboat captain put his devout worshipers, and when, if ever, the end for which they are being used is accomplished, they will be dismissed with an oath as wicked and heartless as was that of the captain of the boat."

The overwhelming defeat of the Liberal-Republican-Democratic candidate was not due wholly to his weakness, although this prevented the protest against the Republicans from being sufficiently vigorous to impress the Party with the necessity of immediate and complete reform within itself. Public opinion is slow to change, sectional feeling still ran high, and the Republican Party was continued in power, flushed with success. Triumph is intoxicating, and refuses to recognize impending disaster. When Grant began his second term as President of the United States, Burrows first took his seat in Congress.



REPRESENTATIVE BURROWS

1872

CHAPTER V

IN CONGRESS AND OUT. 1873-1878

IT would be interesting if Burrows had recorded with undisguised frankness his first impressions of Congress when he once found himself a member of the Lower House. Years before, in the early Pennsylvania days, after the epoch-making experience of listening to Daniel Webster's speech and before he was ten years old, he had been discovered mounted on a stump back of the barn, delivering an oration. The derisive jeers from his brothers hurt his pride but failed to shake his confidence. "I don't care," the embryo statesman reiterated between his sobs of mortification; "some day you will hear my voice in the halls of Congress."

The Republican Party had been, and still was, his ideal. In his campaigning he had exaggerated its merits and minimized its weaknesses; and to do this over and over again inevitably resulted in having the brief which he presented to the people become well-defined in his own mind. Anticipation had now turned into realization,—but the Grand Old Party had sunk far below its early ideals. It was incom-

petent and corrupt, and even its most loyal friend could not fail to recognize its decline nor to appreciate the certainty of impending rebuke at the hands of the people.

There is no question that Burrows did appreciate the situation to the fullest, even though he never gave voice to any such acknowledgment. It is impossible to believe other than that his high ideals were shocked, that his ever-present optimism was rudely shaken. Yet he would have told us, with a sincerity which no one could doubt, that nothing he observed weakened his belief in the Republican Party as an institution; that the very fact of its decline emphasized the need of loyalty on the part of all true Republicans; that its reform was inevitable, and that this reform could come only from within. He was a partisan always, but from conviction rather than from blindness to Party weaknesses. The Republican Party had drawn him into its ranks as a youth with a rekindled conscience, he had seen it preserve the Union and stamp out the curse of slavery. The Democrats, in his mind, were still unpurged of their disloyalty and lack of patriotism, and at their best were less to be trusted than the Republicans at their worst. One might say of Burrows as Thayer says of John Hay, who was obsessed by this same indomitable devotion to the Republican Party: "He was keen

enough to see that thick-and-thin partisanship appears illogical, not to say absurd, to the eyes of pure reason; he repudiated without demur this or that corrupt politician or Party act; but he held that an institution must be judged by its essentials and not by its details, especially when these are unworthy.”¹

Some one once asked Burrows regarding the integrity of men in public life, and his answer was given with much feeling: “Public men,” he declared, “are, with but few exceptions, honest, and are conscientiously trying to serve the public interest. If there are dishonest men in Congress they were dishonest before they came here, and the blame for their being in Washington rests with their constituents, who should have kept them at home. When an honest man is elected to Congress he will continue to be honest; a dishonest man will be the same in one place as in another.”

The Forty-third Congress, of which Burrows now found himself a part, was perhaps less dishonest and less corrupt than its immediately preceding body, but this was due more to the wholesale respect inspired by the righteous indignation of their constituents throughout the Nation than to any real desire on the part of its members as a whole to institute a real reform. The Forty-third Congress was in itself a

¹ *Thayer*: “The Life of John Hay,” volume I, page 423.

remarkable body. It was presided over by James G. Blaine, and Benjamin F. Butler was the most conspicuous member on the floor. "Silver Dick" Bland, of Missouri, "Joe" Cannon, of Illinois, and Thomas C. Platt, of New York, like Burrows became members of the House at this same session. It was a powerful organization, but the *Crédit Mobilier* scandals, brought to light by the Congressional investigation in 1872, had left their taint upon certain of the members still holding their seats with full power and authority.

The *Crédit Mobilier* was an incorporated body through which all the profits received from contracts made for the construction of the Union Pacific Railroad accrued to the controlling stockholders. In 1867, certain financiers, led by Oakes Ames, a member of the House of Representatives from Massachusetts, and holding a majority of the Union Pacific stock, awarded to themselves as controllers of the *Crédit Mobilier* the contract to build and equip a large portion of the road on conditions which guaranteed to them practically all the proceeds from the stock and bonds which the Union Pacific Railroad created. It was desirable to protect this scheme from Congressional interference, and to accomplish this Ames distributed at par a large amount of the stock of the *Crédit Mobilier* among his colleagues in Congress, placing this stock, as he frankly admitted, where it

would do the most good. In less than a year the dividends amounted to about 340 per cent. Among those who accepted the opportunity offered by Ames were some of the most influential men in Congress, and as a result of the investigation a state of corruption was shown up which appalled the American people. Colfax, vice-President with Grant in his first Administration, was seriously tainted; Wilson, vice-President in Grant's second Administration, was also affected. An investigating committee recommended for expulsion Oakes Ames, and James Brooks of New York, but the House merely censured the offending members. Patterson, of New Hampshire, was also recommended for expulsion from the Senate, but as his term expired on March 4, 1873, no action was taken. Many other members who were declared by the committee guilty of corrupt acts or motives were still left over from the Forty-second Congress, with a serious stain against their names in the eyes of their constituents and of the country at large.

The first measure of importance on which Burrows had an opportunity to vote, and in regard to which he addressed Congress, was the so-called Salary Grab Bill. This was a proposition brought up at the close of the previous session to increase the salaries for the President, vice-President, Cabinet officers, judges of the Supreme Court, and members of Congress.

The increase for the Senators and the Representatives of \$2500 a year was made retroactive, and each member voting on the Bill would receive \$5000 for his two years of service just coming to an end. Defended by Butler and opposed by men like Garfield, the Bill was pushed through just before the Forty-second Congress expired, and, as a result, popular feeling ran high. Party lines were forgotten in the denunciation throughout the country of what was termed the "back-pay steal."

This was Burrows' earliest opportunity to sound his note for the reform of the Republican Party and to put on record his high principles of integrity which characterized his position on every question throughout his long service. Many of the members who joined in the successful effort to restore the salaries to the original figures were undoubtedly influenced by the unqualified criticism of their constituents, but Burrows had only his convictions and his conscience to consider. He expressed himself with clearness and firmness in his maiden speech, in the course of which he said:

"If the passage of the salary law of March 3, 1873, was so obnoxious to the American people and fraught with such disastrous consequences to the Republican Party, this protracted discussion over a proposition for its repeal, this hesitancy and debate, will only

serve to heighten that odium and enhance that peril. The longer this discussion continues the less confidence will the people have in the sincerity of our professions or the good faith of our ultimate action. The longer we postpone a vote upon some measure embodying substantial repeal the less will be the merit accorded to our future conduct. That action, which in the beginning would have been regarded as an evidence of public virtue, may be so delayed as to be looked upon as inspired only by public necessity. If we hesitate much longer, when we do vote for repeal, I fear the people will say of us as was said of Cæsar when he put aside the proffered crown, 'He would fain have had it. He was very loath to lay his fingers off it.' "

The financial panic of September, 1873, and its effect upon the industrial condition of the country, forced the political and social condition of the South, still unfortunate and unsatisfactory, into the background, and Congress was concerned for a time with efforts to relieve the distress of commercial interests. One of the suggestions was a proposition to increase the amount of greenbacks in circulation, but this, known as the "Inflation Bill,"¹ was vetoed by President Grant, and a compromise was effected, fixing the maximum at the amount actually in circulation.

¹ See also page 322.

This compromise left bad feeling on both sides, the "hard money" members being squarely aligned against the "soft money"¹ members. Burrows' position on this Bill was influenced by that taken by Senator Ferry, of Michigan, and the young Representative made a stirring speech in favor of the "blood-stained" greenback. This was later to operate against him politically, as hosts of Western voters became alienated from the Republican Party, looking upon the National Bank System as a device catering solely to the advantage of Eastern financiers. With this weakening of Party strength came, during 1874, further revelations of corruption which reflected upon the Administration. Investigations became the order of the day, and Grant's blind devotion to his friends in spite of the revelations caused further rumblings of discontent. Many influential men in the Republican Party came to believe that the influences which controlled Grant were distinctly against the best interests of the country at large, and the President's final abandonment of Civil Service Reform intensified this impression.

During this first term of Congress, Burrows took part in the debate upon a House Bill to regulate commerce among the States when carried on by railroad

¹ The term "soft money" included the doctrines of all who opposed specie or hard money as the basis of the monetary system.

corporations existing by virtue of State law. His speech was delivered on March 14, 1874, and stamped him at once as a profound constitutional lawyer. It was in the beginnings of the discussion of this subject, later to become so important; the field was new, and its leading principles remained to be developed. Burrows' speech dwelt upon the essential features of this question, and demonstrated its essential principles as they are understood today after the subject has received incessant investigation. His argument was, first, that control of the subject lay in Congress and nowhere else, that the power of Congress in the premises was ample, absolute, exclusive, and supreme. A long line of authorities and decisions in the upper courts, bearing upon the point, were grouped in this speech, establishing the power of Congress beyond all doubt. The limitations on the action of Congress in the jurisdiction of the State over all commerce not extending past its boundaries was also fully established. It was made clear, as a fundamental principle, that the authority of Congress could not be construed as limited to navigation, as the railroad interests had proposed; and, moreover, that it was the function of Congress, when the occasion for its exercise arose, to bring the transportation tariffs under principles of law conforming to the public interest.

As this was an entirely new branch of statecraft, the question had to be treated under the authorization of the Constitution, and it was necessary to adapt the provisions on this subject to a branch of the public interest not dreamed of at the time the Constitution was framed. Garfield said of Burrows' argument: "It is a white light that will clearly guide and mark the course of railroad legislation for all time to come." It is interesting to note that the position taken by Burrows over forty years ago is exactly that more recently taken by Roosevelt, Knox, and other authorities.

Burrows was allied with the Radicals and hopelessly in the minority in the second session of the Forty-third Congress, and the only measure which they succeeded in passing in the face of opposition by Democrats and moderate Republicans was an amendment to the original Civil Rights Bill, and in this Burrows took active part. This had been Sumner's pet measure just before his death; in fact, on his death-bed Sumner secured from E. Rockwood Hoar a promise to push the Bill through. In brief, the Bill stood as a guarantee of equal rights to the negroes in all hotels, places of amusement, and public conveyances, and forbade their exclusion from juries. Several Republican States had already begun to conduct their common schools on a basis of equality, and

the plan was furnishing its own justification. The powerful necessity for securing the utmost diffusion of intelligence in the old slave States, and the certainty that division of educational resources among two sets of schools would defeat the ends aimed at in the case of the colored people, were used to strong effect in Burrows' speech.¹ He believed that its passage was absolutely essential to a full expression of the obligations assumed by the Republican Party with the successful outcome of the war.

"Shall it be said," he cried passionately on the floor, "that this grand Party, which with determined courage beat back the propagandists of the slave power in their encroachments upon our territory, unfurled the banner of liberty and equality, and achieved the victory of 1860; hewed with gleaming swords the fetters from four millions of bondsmen; wiped from the Constitution the last recognition of the rights of man to hold property in man; and placed all upon an equality before the law—shall it now be said that this Party falters and fails before a proposition to protect the black man in the simplest yet most sacred rights of American citizenship? I cannot, I will not believe it. For myself, I will never be guilty of such shameless treachery, nor lower the standard of their defense one inch from its lofty bearing. By

¹ February 5, 1875.

their unswerving loyalty in the midst of treason; by their patient endurance in camp and on the march; by their fidelity, which knew no treachery; by their heroism in battle, which made them insensible to danger; by their devotion to the Republic in the hour of its supremest peril, and in the name of the Constitution of my country, upon which they stand secure, I demand for them equal civil rights and equal protection wherever the shadow of our banner falls."

With the passing of the Civil Rights Bill the long record of partisan legislation on reconstruction came to an end.

Burrows' speech in support of this Bill attracted wide attention, and marked the beginning of his National reputation as an orator. Letters of congratulation poured in on him, but none pleased him more than one received from his brother Jerome.

From Jerome Bonaparte Burrows

PAINESVILLE, OHIO, February 7, 1875

I had the satisfaction of reading in my New York *Tribune* this morning that you had apparently made a good hit by your speech on the Civil Rights Bill. I read the *Tribune* extract or report of your remarks, but could get no idea as to their merit. It would be precisely like trying to pass on some effort of my own. I can only say that the remarks were followed by "applause" from floor and gallery, and by warm con-

gratulations of Republican members. That satisfied and gratified me to such an extent that I wept for joy. I write now to send my congratulations and joy for your success. . . .

The last act of Burrows in the Forty-third Congress was to speak on the Security of Elections, on February 27, 1875. This was a Bill to prevent the subversion of authority in the States, and in his speech he made a strong appeal for the fairness and security of the ballot. In rhetorical effect and in the application of the needs of the country to the policy of the Bill it became famous. It was widely published and commended, and was made the subject of a striking cartoon by Nast in *Harper's Weekly*.

There was no doubt that the methods employed by the whites in demonstrating their superiority in Alabama and other Southern States were intolerable, yet the moderate Republicans, aided materially by Speaker Blaine, succeeded in filibustering to delay the progress of the Bill until, when passed by the House by a narrow margin, it was too late for action on the part of the Senate. Burrows was stirred to the depths by the coercion of the blacks and the violence at the polls, and he expressed himself in ringing words:

“If the history of the South for these ten years

could be written in all its horrible details," he said, "it would present one of the blackest pages in the peaceful annals of the civilized world. . . . Men of the South, there is a road to peace, and there is but one road. In it lies a peaceful solution of all our difficulties. Whether you pursue it is a matter of your own free choice. It is a highway on which if you will but walk you will find speedy and enduring peace, and unexampled prosperity. Men of all Parties can walk on it, for it is obstructed by no constitutional doubts, but is paved by the Federal compact. May I point you to it? Behold it here. Strip the hideous masks from your outlawed Ku-Klux; disband your White Leagues; visit swift and condign punishment upon your unarrested and untried felons, and enforce State and Federal law with a firm hand. Give to human life some security and to property protection; recognize the equality of all men before the law, and their right to its fullest guardianship; put out the fires of your burning churches and school-houses; make the freedom of the ballot so secure that there shall be no intimidation; let free speech be recognized; let ostracism be unknown; renew your allegiance to the Government; extend a generous welcome to Northern labor and Northern capital; abandon all hope of the lost cause. In a word, 'accept the situation' in good faith and in



REQUIRED TO LIVE UNDER A NEW ORDER OF THINGS

F. F., Esq. "During Slavery, I ruled supreme; while Know-Nothingism lasted, I killed Foreigners; in the War, I killed Yankees; and since then, both White and Black Niggers; but now you are taking away all my Privileges, what shall I do?"

NAST CARTOON FROM "HARPER'S WEEKLY"

"Men of the South, there is a road to peace, and there is but one road. In it lies a peaceful solution of all our difficulties. May I point you to it? Behold it here. Strip the hideous masks from your outlawed Ku-Klux; disband your White Leagues; visit swift and condign punishment upon your unarrested and untried felons, and enforce State and Federal law with a firm hand. Give to human life some security and to property protection; recognize the equality of all men before the law, and their right to its fullest guardianship; put out the fires of your burning churches and school-houses; make the freedom of the ballot so secure that there shall be no intimidation; let free speech be recognized; let ostracism be unknown; renew your allegiance to the Government; extend a generous welcome to Northern labor and Northern capital; abandon all hope of the lost cause. In a word 'accept the situation' in good faith and in the highest sense, and you will have a peace universal." (From speech of Representative J. C. BURROWS, February 27, 1875.)

the highest sense, and you will have a peace universal. Do this, and your barren fields will stir with a new life; your desolate cities will echo with the hum of returning industry; your spacious harbors will choke with the tide of commerce. Do this, and the whole South will spring from her baptism of blood into the fullness of a new life, redeemed and regenerated forever. All hail that auspicious day!"

The condition in which the country found itself as a result of the panic of 1873 proved an important factor in the Fall elections. During the four years immediately preceding there had existed an unprecedented industrial activity and a corresponding expansion. Particularly was this true in the case of railroads, which had been built far in advance of present requirements, and therefore failed to yield returns on the invested capital. The Republican Party was held responsible for these unsatisfactory conditions, and the plight of the Party was made worse by its failure to produce campaign material from the outrages in the South, inasmuch as many of the statements were shown to be overdrawn and untrustworthy. It was simply one more straw on top of a long accumulating mass of unsavory evidence which produced a tidal wave, sweeping Democratic officials into Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Massachusetts, weakening Republican predominance through-

out the country, and defeating so many Republican candidates for Congress that the coming House of Representatives had a Democratic majority of nearly seventy. For the first time since the Southern States seceded the Democratic Party found itself placed in a position of equality in legislative administration.

The Republican Party was in the throes of demoralization, and Burrows went out of office not through any loss of personal popularity or prestige, but because the people of Michigan, in common with other Republican States, were determined to place their protest on record. As a result, the Greeley-Democratic candidate, Allen Potter, was elected to the Forty-fourth Congress.

The four years between the Forty-third and the Forty-sixth Congresses offered Burrows the longest consecutive period for the practice of his profession since entering the field of National politics; but even these years were filled with political activity. No doubt existed in his mind as to the certainty of his return to Washington, and each day's work was in preparation for the larger activities which he felt were sure to come.

The reputation of Burrows as a campaigner came strongly to the front during these years. His ability in this direction was well known to his constituents,

and his Party leaders were now beginning to realize that these talents should be given National expression. In March, 1875, Burrows made a brilliant campaign for the Republicans in New Hampshire; in May of the same year he spoke in Philadelphia from the front of Independence Hall; and in July he made a stumping tour in California, speaking with great effectiveness in every large city of the State.

The early speeches made by Burrows in Congress continue to strike one as being overloaded with florid expression and grandiloquent oratory, and it is interesting to note how the style of the orator changes as the years advance and as the demands of the people become different. Burrows, in common with other orators, gave the people what they wanted, and the style of oratory may be followed with accuracy in determining, during any period, the nature of the people's spirit. Take, for example, the following report of one of Burrows' speeches from the Oakland (Cal.) *Transcript*, and note the fervid expression of the daily press of that period:

"Cold type and printers' ink cannot convey the fiery words and glowing apostrophes of the eloquent speaker. It would require the inspired pen and glowing imagery of an Ezekiel to paint the descriptive word-panorama of the orator. He moved his audience as the changing winds move the great ocean—

now carrying them along with the force of a Gulf Stream argument; now tossing them into rippling whitecaps of mirth and laughter; then drawing a picture which moistened the eyes of the hearers with passionate tears, and again stirring the vast audience into tumultuous waves of applause and shouts with his storm of eloquence. It was the first time in more than four years that the old Republican fires have been kindled to a blaze upon the sacred altars, and the people wondered that they had allowed those fires to wane and smoulder.”

Burrows’ political speeches in each campaign varied somewhat as to topics, but essentially in language and expression. The results possessed mathematical precision, but the presentation of the material was distinctly original. This gave to each speech the novelty of exposition which served to interest even those who had previously listened to him. Burrows had the reputation of being the most instructive speaker in the Republican Party. He possessed a broad grasp of Governmental affairs; he had the experience derived from struggling for many years with problems of legislation; he had knowledge of current events and topics of foreign and domestic import; his historical acquirements and his deep insight into State affairs and into all the great ques-

tions of National policy qualified him to be a teacher on these subjects. This personal equipment, together with his talents as an orator, made his speeches especially appreciated by men and women of all Parties.

On his way home from the Pacific Coast, in 1875, Burrows spoke in Nevada, and spent a week in Iowa campaigning for the Republican ticket. No sooner had he reached Michigan than he was immediately summoned to Ohio, where he joined Hayes, Senator Sherman, Senator Morton, and Carl Schurz, making sixteen speeches in the larger cities of the State. In the following Spring (1876) he opened the campaign in New Hampshire.

This was the year when Burrows confidently expected to return to Congress, as the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan was satisfied with its rebuke of the Republican Party in 1874, and had returned safely to the Republican fold; but he was to have his first experience in local Party treachery. Burrows was a man who took other men at their face value. He himself was straightforward and loyal, and he expected nothing else from those around him. So it was that the disloyalty of men whom he had considered friends stung him far more than mere defeat. The fact that he made a memorandum in his scrap-

book at this time is in itself an evidence of the depth of his feeling, for he was by nature inclined to accept things philosophically as they came:

“For my own personal gratification,” he notes, “I want to record that I was defeated for the nomination to Congress from the Fourth District of Michigan in the year of our Lord 1876 by the most unblushing treachery of supposed friends which has come to light in eighteen hundred and forty-three years. Clapp and Hull of St. Joseph County betrayed me, and while in Convention of fifty-two delegates I was promised more than enough to nominate, I received only twenty-three,—four less than sufficient, and Keightley¹ was nominated by a trick, a fraud.”

Here was the opportunity for Burrows to put his creed into practical operation, and he proved the sincerity of his spoken word. “Let me assure you,” you remember he stated publicly, “that nothing of any private character; no personal grievance however great; no personal matter, however it may wound my pride,—nothing shall ever drive me from the ranks of that grand old Party.”

There was no evidence in Burrows’ attitude that he harbored the slightest resentment toward any individual, nor was he less zealous in campaigning for the Presidential ticket than he would have been had the

¹ Judge Edwin F. Keightley, of St. Joseph County.

campaign possessed a personal interest for himself. Indeed, his activity in his own State helped to elect Keightley. In all he made more than ninety speeches in New York, Michigan, and Indiana, and in the last-named State campaigned with Benjamin Harrison and Schuyler Colfax. As to the effectiveness of his speaking, Colfax in a personal letter dated at South Bend, Indiana, September 6, 1876, wrote: "No speech delivered here for years has had the effect yours had. I can count a dozen whom I know of, who had become doubtful or adverse, who were 'straightened out' by your most telling speech. The universal demand is that you must come here again before our October election, and your crowd, large as it was, will be quadrupled. You need not trouble yourself about any new speech. Amplified as it must be by your repetition of it, it will suit exactly, and to three-quarters of your hearers will be all new. But you must not omit about the Rebel claim titles and R-e-f-o-r-m. We have a last grand rally (before Oct. election) at Mishawaka 4 miles off, Saturday afternoon, Oct. 7th, and here Monday night, Oct. 9th. We want you for both, but I suppose that will be impossible, delighted as we should be to have you. But without fail we want you here Monday night, ('the night before the battle, mother') and you must not say 'No' to that. . . ."

The Hayes campaign and election, ending as it did in such a dramatic climax, offered Burrows an unusual opportunity to put himself into his speeches. It was a disappointment to him that Blaine had failed to receive the nomination, but he felt, as did others of Blaine's friends, that it was only a postponement for the great statesman. Hayes was far less able than the opponent he defeated in the Republican Convention; but he stood a staunch foe of corruption, and was strong as a Civil Service reformer. Tilden, the Democratic nominee, was a worthy opponent, and the Republican Party had given the Democrats ample opportunity for criticism and condemnation to be made use of in the campaign. The closeness of the election, Hayes and Wheeler finally being declared elected by 185 to 184 electoral votes, shows the intensity of the campaign; and the success of the Republican Party in capturing all the contested electoral votes introduced an exciting element which stirred men to the depths. Indeed, these disputes will never be settled. There is undoubtedly much to criticise on both sides, but the discovery made later by a committee appointed to investigate election frauds in the South of a secret cipher and telegraphic correspondence between close friends of Tilden, which arranged for bribery of the returning Boards, gives historians greater authority for considering

Hayes' election as legal. This, however, can never explain how the Democratic governors could be elected on the same tickets which were thrown out as fraudulent when considering the Presidential electors.

When the time came for the next campaign for Congress (1878) Burrows was a more seasoned politician. He had made up his mind to sit in the Forty-sixth Congress, and he did not intend to permit any slip to compass his defeat. The ease with which he secured the nomination did not lull him into any false confidence, nor did the expressions of congratulation received from statesmen of National reputation, who by this time had become his personal friends. On August 3, 1878, Blaine wrote him from Augusta, Maine: "I congratulate you cordially on your nomination. Many friends—new and old—will hail with delight your return to public life. But the first thing to carry Michigan is to secure a rousing victory in Maine, and we want you to lend the aid of your persuasive eloquence to do it. We want you to begin with us in Portland Monday, Aug. 19th, and take a starring tour of fifteen or twenty days through our largest and best towns. You cannot estimate the amount of good you can do. Our State Committee are unanimous and enthusiastic for you. Please telegraph me to make the appointments."

Schuyler Colfax wrote him again from South Bend,

under date of August 9, 1878: "Although out of political life myself, with neither desire nor willingness to return to it in any capacity, I am especially glad that one so admirably fitted for it by eloquence and energy, and who deserved it so well, has been nominated for Congress in your district; and I hope there is no doubt of your triumphant reelection, although we hear strange rumors from Michigan of doubts as to the result in that once overwhelmingly Republican State. . . ."

Burrows responded to Blaine's invitation to spend two weeks campaigning with him in Maine. In return, Blaine later went to Michigan and assisted him in his own campaign, visiting him at his home, and strengthening the friendship which existed up to the time of the "plumed knight's" death. During the campaign Burrows made one hundred and fifteen speeches, averaging two hours each. He came through triumphant, and was elected to the Forty-sixth Congress by a handsome plurality. Even up to the last, however, Burrows was fearful lest something might occur to bring about a repetition of his disappointment two years earlier, and he urged Blaine to come to Michigan for a second time. Blaine in explaining why he could not respond, also gives the embryo statesman advice from the experience of an elder statesman.

From James G. Blaine

AUGUSTA, MAINE, *November 10, 1878*

MY DEAR BURROWS:

I did not get your letter till the campaign was nearly over—I only got home day before yesterday. But I knew you were not in danger. Victory was in the air for you. You did not need me! Your defeat two years ago made you over-cautious. In your many victories of the future you will have absolute confidence. My sincere regards and congratulations to Mrs. Burrows—and your daughter—I fell in love with both. . . .

The return of Burrows to Congress attracted more than ordinary interest, as he had already come to be looked upon as a growing power in his Party, and one upon whom the leaders had already begun to lean. Moses Coit Tyler wrote him from the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, on November 8, 1878: “I want to tell you that I am one of the many who rejoice over your return to Congress, where I hope and believe you will have a career still more distinguished than before. The Republican Party must and will stand steady for political and financial honor. Your recent speeches in the good cause I have heard spoken of with the highest praise. Success attend you.”

Senator T. W. Ferry wrote from Grand Haven,

Michigan, November 9, 1878: "Many congratulations on your splendid success, due greatly to your efficient canvass. I am glad you go in with so large a majority. Your thorough canvass has made you more intimately and favorably known in your district. One genial woman under your roof will laugh more heartily, and win you, as she always does, more friends. Kind regards to her. Best wishes."

Colfax wrote again (November 9, 1878): "I write to congratulate you with all my heart on the magnificent victory you won in your district last Tuesday,—honorable to the district and thrice honorable to yourself. I know the odds you had to encounter, and which enhanced the brilliancy of your successful campaign. With best wishes (although mad that you didn't come and speak to us)."

After the election Burrows settled down again to his law practice while waiting for the opening of the Forty-sixth Congress, taking Frank Knappen, a son of his former associate, into partnership under the firm name of Burrows & Knappen. In a memorandum in his scrap-book he records: "This year (1878) I lose a sister and my father, so that I have left of my kin only five brothers. How rapidly my family is gathering on the other side!"

CHAPTER VI

BACK IN CONGRESS. 1879-1885

THE experiences of the four years out of Congress represented Burrows' first real political education, and resulted in making him more thorough in his analyses of public questions and more genuinely effective in his approach to National problems. Previously his oratory had been almost too persuasive, and this was dangerous to his own personal development. The ease with which he had swayed audiences by the spell of his personality and the effectiveness of his eloquence had lulled him into a sense of false security. A careful examination into his speeches previous to this time shows surface excellence rather than basic solidity.

His defeats had given Burrows time and opportunity for self-analysis. He had learned that to produce lasting effects upon his audiences he must not only win their sympathetic interest but must educate them to look with his eyes upon the various problems of the day. From this time on one finds a growing mastery of the causes which Burrows espoused, and his appeal becomes correspondingly

more effective. His campaigning from the Atlantic to the Pacific had given him a broader outlook upon life in general, and a deeper knowledge of the great country of which he had previously spoken with limited personal acquaintance. An Iowa paper, reporting one of his campaign speeches, says:

“He possesses those remarkable gifts of an orator brought by familiar contact with the masses. Still, he is a man of polish, with fury, animation, and nerve that enable him to command the largest audiences. . . . He made running comments that brought down the house. With apt anecdote, humorous allusions, stories that went straight to the mark, he held his audience spellbound. Facts, figures, statements, records, presented in the manner of Mr. Burrows are not forgotten; they are treasured up. . . . Mr. Burrows speaks like a man of the people. He knows the beating of the great heart of the Nation. He has been deep down among the masses and has felt the pulses of patriotism and devotion to the Union, whence he has obtained the inspiration that animates his efforts. Filled with such inspiration, he electrifies his audience. Fortified with facts, he makes his logic irrepressible. It carries conviction, it rivets unfailing attention, and has left a record on the present campaign second to none. He is another Ingersoll in his overwhelming

treatment of political issues, in his novel and original way of presenting them. He is always and at all times master of the situation."

Burrows' facility in meeting interruption during his campaigning always added to the enjoyment of his audiences. Once, when speaking on the Civil Rights Bill, a man demanded, in a thick and unsteady voice, whether he thought "a nigger was as good as a white man." "I don't know," replied Burrows; "but if five or six very strong men will bring the white man up here we will look him over and tell him just how good he is."

It was a different Burrows, then, which returned to Congress in 1879, for the four years had been momentous in the development of his personal asset. He found the Forty-sixth Congress Democratic. Randall was Speaker, and Garfield was the Republican leader on the floor. Burrows seems consciously or unconsciously to have selected Garfield as a model, just as earlier he had taken Daniel Webster. Like him, Garfield had been a poor boy in the Western Reserve, a schoolmaster before he reached his majority, an ornate speaker while learning the meaning of true oratory, and a loyal soldier in the War of the Rebellion.

Burrows soon made himself so vital a part of the House of Representatives that some one included him

with Blaine, Garfield, and Logan among "Columbia's four aces in the Congressional game." The fact that he was not a member of the Forty-fifth Congress undoubtedly made it easier for him to give his unqualified support to President Hayes in the crisis which forced the calling of the Forty-sixth Congress in extraordinary session, March 18 to July 1, 1879. That he would have supported him is certain, such was his Party loyalty, but it cannot be denied that the President's concessions to the South had at least proved disappointing. To Burrows, the South was not yet purged of her original sin, and his high spirit, born in the stirring epoch preceding the war, and fanned to white heat on the battlefield, still resented what seemed to him to be the over-zealousness of the leaders of his own Party in placating the antagonisms, and in leaning backwards in giving the Southern States more than their share in the government of the re-united States.

During Hayes' entire administration the executive action was grossly handicapped by the Democratic majority and by the lukewarm support of the Republican minorities. The President vetoed the Bland-Allison Act, requiring the coinage of silver intrinsically below market value, yet to be accepted as legal tender for payment of debts,—but the Bill was passed over his veto. The efforts made by the Government

to retire the notes and greenbacks still in existence were blocked by the hostile law-makers. But the climax of the antagonism of the Democratic Congress was the attempt to coerce the President through the medium of Army Appropriations. Riders were put upon every Bill favored by the Executive, and the most objectionable was that which would have compelled the President to repeal permission for the army to keep peace at the polls in order to secure any appropriation for its support. No one seriously contended that the presence of the military was intended by the Republican Party to influence any man's vote, but rather to protect voters from intimidation. In the deadlock which ensued the Forty-fifth Congress passed out of existence, leaving the army with no provision for its maintenance.

This was the situation which Burrows found when he assembled with the Forty-sixth Congress in extra session, after his four years' absence from Washington. To him, it was another call to arms, no less serious than the one he had so promptly answered in 1862. Any disappointment he may have felt over the President's past actions was forgotten; this was where his Chief needed his support. But he was patient, listening to the arguments on the opponents' side of the House with eager diligence. Some one once asked Napoleon, when a student at Brienne, where he

would get his ammunition if he were surrounded by hostile forces. "From the enemy, sir!" was his prompt response. So it was with Burrows. He heard Turner, of Kentucky, say, "If Mr. Hayes vetoes this Bill on account of the sixth section guarding the right of suffrage, then the responsibility for starving the army will rest on his shoulders, and not on ours." He heard Chalmers, of Mississippi, declare, "If free government must die, and die at the hands of such a President as this, then the Democratic Party can look in the face of the expiring Goddess of Liberty and say, 'Shake not thy gory locks at me, thou canst not say I did it.'" He listened to Tucker, of Virginia, to Blackburn and Beck, of Kentucky, to Thurman, of Ohio, while they solemnly asserted, "We cannot yield, and will not surrender," "We will give him the army on the single condition that it shall never be used or be present at the polls," "Whether the course be right or wrong, it will be adopted, no matter what happens to the Appropriation Bills." Another speaker declared, "The President in exercising his veto power is resisting the will of the majority in Congress, and therefore his wishes should be disregarded," and Burrows retorted with characteristic wit: "Did it ever occur to the constitutional lawyers upon the other side of this Chamber that the veto power of the President is always exercised against the

will of the majority of both houses of Congress; that until a measure shall have passed Congress the President is powerless to veto? I have been unable to find a single instance where any President ever vetoed a measure that had not passed Congress."

Then, just a month after the extra session had convened, Burrows was ready for his attack. McKinley, of Ohio, preceded him with a masterly speech, but McKinley had not just re-entered public life after four years of patient waiting for this opportunity again to play his part in the war councils of his Party. To McKinley, it was a conflict of forensics; to Burrows, it was a new conspiracy against the Republic. So, on April 18, 1879, Burrows the soldier again drew his sword in defence, and entered the battle with the courage of one who knows that his cause is just.

"I have no disposition," he said, "to revive or discuss the issues of the war. . . . No sooner had the Republican minority of this House, overborne by numbers, been driven from its first entrenchment where it made a stand in the defense of a peaceful ballot, than it is again assaulted by an exultant and defiant majority, and forced to do battle in the defense of a pure ballot. Now, as then, we present upon this side of the Chamber a solid front, confident of the strength of our position and the justice of our cause, and confident also that though defeated now we shall

ultimately be supported by that mighty reserve, the majority of the American people, whose invincible power no Party can possibly withstand. . . .

“I have neither the time nor the disposition to enter into a general discussion of the character of those laws sought to be repealed. Their nature and purpose are well known to the House and the country; but I cannot refrain from observing that if the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber are really anxious to preserve the peace and purity of the ballot-box, why attempt to tear down the only remaining National fortress reared for the defense of either? Do you desire, gentlemen, an honest registration? Those laws provide for it. Do you want a pure ballot? They promote it. Do you want a fair count? They insure it. Do you desire a true return? They enjoin it. Do you want order and peace at the polls? They command it. Do you want repeaters and ballot-box stuffers, thugs, and red-shirts punished? They secure it. And there is nothing in these laws that is a terror to any man except to him who has already committed or is now meditating some outrage upon the ballot-box of the country.

“You declare that you want a pure and peaceable election; and while you have been unsparing in your denunciation of all means employed by the Federal Government to insure it, not one word of rebuke, not

a word of regret even, has fallen from the lips of any man on that side of the Chamber for the outrages perpetrated at the polls in the South, especially in Louisiana and in South Carolina, not six months ago; in South Carolina, where you carried the elections by a system of frauds and ballot-box stuffing unparalleled in the history of nations; in Louisiana, by driving voters from the polls, seizing ballot-boxes through the instrumentality of armed ruffians, destroying ballots, driving men into exile, and invoking that system of murder and intimidation so long in vogue in the South, and which has been so efficient in crushing an entire race. . . .

“When I read such a history and remember how you have overcome majorities in the South and stamped out a Party in blood, and made free speech and a free press, free homes, free emigration, and a free ballot impossible within many portions of the Southern States, I must confess that I listen with impatience to the hypercritical cant about peace, protection, and purity at the polls. This very hour, while you are professing such jealous care for the rights of American citizens, a whole race is fleeing from your presence as they would fly from a pestilence. Not to escape Federal bayonets, but Southern bludgeons! not to escape Federal bullets, but Southern bowie-knives; not to escape Federal interference, but

Southern intimidation; not to escape Federal force, but Southern fraud; not to escape election laws, but enforced exile; not to escape from Federal marshals, but from Southern murders; not from honest registration, but from masked raiders; not from supervisors of election laws, but from Southern shotguns. In a word, fleeing from a people and country where their every right is cloven down and their every wrong unredressed. When I hear gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber denounce these outrages upon a free ballot and free men in the Southern States, it will be time for me to believe that you are really sincere and solicitous for the protection of the citizen and the purity of the ballot-box. . . .

“Pardon me if I express my honest convictions that with all your professions you want neither peace nor purity at the polls. Your chiefest desire is the election of a Democratic President in 1880. By what means you little care. You want these laws repealed because they stand in the way of the consummation of such a purpose, for you know full well, and the country knows, that if they are permitted to stand, and can be enforced, and every man in this Republic, North and South, allowed to vote as his conscience dictates, without injury or fear of injury to life or property, you could no more elect your President in 1880 than you

are honestly entitled to your majority in either House of this Congress today. . . .

“Let me recount a brief but startling history. On the 4th day of March just passed the President of the United States, by public proclamation, informed the country that the Forty-fifth Congress had closed its deliberations ‘without making the usual and necessary appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880, and without making the usual and necessary appropriations for the support of the army for the same fiscal year.’

“Every statement in that proclamation is literally true. That Congress did adjourn without making the slightest provision for the support of the legislative, executive, or judicial branches of the Government, and without appropriating one single dollar for the support of the army of the United States. That same Congress knew, the moment it adjourned, that if no further legislation was had until the time for the regular session of this Congress in December next, it was inevitable that in less than four months from the hour of its adjournment the three great pillars that sustain and support the Federal fabric would, unless upheld by the omnipotent arm of a patriotic people, crumble and fall, while the army,

disbanded by starvation, would not be suffered to survive the desolation that it might even stand guard over the sacred ruins.

“That same Congress knew the moment it adjourned that if matters were undisturbed, that if the country now would comply with what Jefferson Davis demanded in 1861, ‘Let us alone,’ the rising sun of July 1, 1879, would gild, not the temple, but the tomb of the Republic. Had there been no Executive to disturb this plot the Nation today would be tottering to its dissolution. Yet, thanks to the President of the United States, thanks to his patriotism and his courage, it is made possible for us to avert so dire a calamity.”

Then the speaker began to draw upon the ammunition he had taken from the enemy, and the Democratic side of the House was aghast at the deadly effect made with their own words. Finally Burrows summed up his case:

“The distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Blackburn),” he said, “the acknowledged leader of at least the Southern wing of the Democratic Party of this House, took occasion to say in his recent speech in this Hall that ‘this side of the Chamber,’ alluding to the Democratic majority, ‘never means to yield or surrender until this Congress shall have died by virtue of its limitation.’ I have given his exact

words. That event cannot happen until the 4th of March, 1881.

“And so the order is promulgated from the Federal Capitol, in the face of this Nation, by an ex-Confederate soldier, to prosecute the siege until this Republic, which he and his co-conspirators could not destroy by the sword, shall be reduced by starvation, And no sooner is the order given than the whole Democratic Party, North and South, leap into the trenches at the rallying cry of their chosen leader, ‘He who dallies is a dastard, and he who doubts is damned.’ Thus is the siege begun, thus is it prosecuted. And with an air of defiance, smacking a little of Southern domination, we are told that ‘the issue is laid down, the gage of battle is delivered; lift it when you please.’ Be it so, and be this my answer: that it is our supremest pleasure to lift it now and here, and we are prepared to make good the appeal.

“We accept the challenge you now present in no spirit of boastful arrogance, but with an unflinching purpose and a sublime courage, awaiting the issue with the utmost confidence and composure. It is not the first time we have encountered a Solid South conspiring against the life of the Republic; and although your forces may be somewhat augmented by your Northern allies, yet I see nothing in the increased array to cause a heart to faint or a cheek to blanch.

As you failed then you will fail now. As you could not kill, you cannot starve. Did it ever occur to you, gentlemen, that although you should withhold all supplies for the support of the Government that possibly it might yet survive? Did it ever occur to you that although you should protract this siege until this Congress shall have died by virtue of its limitation, that possibly there would be no necessity for surrender? Withhold support from the Executive, are you quite sure there will be no President? Refuse to feed the army, are you entirely certain there will be no troops? Deny to your navy the means to keep it afloat, are you certain you will force it to anchor? Withhold support from the judiciary, is it clear there will be no courts? Refuse the needed supplies for maintaining the legislative branch of the Government, are you confident there will be no Congress? Why, sir, you are as impotent to overthrow the Government by starvation as you were to annihilate it by the sword. You may distress, but you cannot destroy. For, let me tell you, when that time comes the same loyal people from the same loyal States who took their lives in their hands, and went forth to do battle for the defense of the Republic, enduring the weary march, the protracted siege, the smoking hell of battle, and the more horrible hell of Southern prison-pens, until from the dark waves of rebellion they bore upon broken arm

and lacerated breast the bleeding form of the Republic, and planted her feet upon the immutable rock of constitutional government and civil liberty—I say from the same States thirty millions of people, animated by the same patriotism, will, when you attempt to starve this Republic, fly to her side at the first cry of her distress, and there they will stand in ceaseless vigil, not with sword, but with sustenance; not with the implements of war, but with unmeasured wealth; not with shotted cannon, but with unlocked coffers; not with bandages, but with bounty; and, bending over her prostrate form, will they succor and sustain her, ministering to her necessities, until, in the fullness of time, they can wrench from her throat the cowardly hands that clutch it; and then, thrilled with a new life, will she spring to her feet, and the very altar you builded for her immolation shall become a throne upon which she shall stand, in the majesty of her power, re-sceptered and re-crowned, goddess of nations.”

An excellent picture of the scene is given in the contemporary press: “If the speech of McKinley stirred up the Confederate animals, that of Burrows lashed them into passionate fury. The countenances of the Confederates while undergoing this terrible ordeal were a curious study. They were red with anger, distorted by muscular efforts to hold in check

tempestuous passions, and twisted by cynical grimaces of pent-up madness. Only three or four interruptions of the speaker were attempted, the manner of his refusal to be interrupted discouraging a repetition of them. Only two or three times was the close attention of the House broken by applause, but when he sat down the whole Left broke out in enthusiasm, and the new-found champion in debate was warmly congratulated. Nearly at the same time a number of wrathful members of the Right tried to get the floor for personal explanation, and another scene of the wildest excitement ensued, at the height of which again were seen the two long arms and clenched fists of that untamed Kentuckian (Blackburn), brandished furiously in the manner of punching the whole opposite side of the Chamber. The man accompanied his bellicose gesticulations with perhaps equally furious words, but what they were no one could hear in the confusion of tongues and the tornado of laughter which so ridiculous a spectacle provoked."

The Army Appropriation Bill was finally passed without its rider, and from this time on Burrows' local reputation as a speaker became National.

In 1880 Burrows was reëlected to the Forty-seventh Congress over Orlando W. Powers, who later had a meteoric career in Utah. His campaign for

reelection was really a stumping tour for Garfield and Arthur, and wherever Burrows went he made votes for the entire ticket. The success of his earlier campaign speeches outside his own State made him much in demand from his Party leaders, and he was called into Wisconsin and Indiana, into Maine and Vermont. In one of his Eastern speeches Burrows made reference to Hancock's famous utterance, "The tariff is a local issue." Burrows had been stating his views as to the Tariff question, and in conclusion remarked, "At least that is the way I look at it; but I will go home and ask my constituents how *they* look at it!"

The Republican platform in this campaign was for high tariff, equal rights for negroes, for the restriction of Chinese immigration, and denounced the Solid South; while against this the Democrats placed Hancock and English, calling for home rule, honest money, tariff for revenue only, and the restoration of American commerce, denouncing the "fraud" by which Hayes had been made President, and the continued use of Federal troops at the polls. The Greenbackers made a slight show, but in no way affected the result. From a Republican standpoint, the only serious aspect of the election was the absolute Democratic consolidation of the electoral vote of the South.

Burrows was present at Garfield's inauguration and for the first time saw a President inducted into office. The Forty-seventh Congress was barely again Republican, the Lower House having a majority of one and the Senate being tied. This slender advantage was distinctly favorable to public morality, as no member of either Party could afford to take chances with his constituents. Burrows was a member of the Committee on Appropriations and Chairman of the Committee on Territories, and had attained sufficient prominence at the beginning of the session to aspire to the Speakership. Most prominent among the other candidates for this position were "Tom" Reed, of Maine, Frank Hiscock, of New York, John A. Kasson, of Iowa, and J. W. Keifer, of Ohio, the last-named candidate finally securing the coveted honor. There were many of Burrows' best friends in the House, however, who considered even his candidacy as a mistake from a Party standpoint: Garfield had been elevated to the Presidency, Blaine had become Secretary of State, Frye and Conger had gone from the House to the Senate, which left Burrows and Cannon as the real leaders of the Party in the Lower House, and many felt that Burrows was too eloquent an orator to be taken off the floor. His qualifications for the position, however, were demonstrated during the session when he was made the Speaker *pro tem.*,

and conducted the affairs of the House during Keifer's absence with rare tact and acknowledged parliamentary ability.

A fellow-Congressman once said of Burrows: "He never takes part in debate unless he knows his subject thoroughly and has something to contribute to the general discussion. At no time, however, is Burrows caught napping. When apparently not personally interested in a measure, he suddenly 'bobs up' with some parliamentary question which is of inestimable value to his Party."

An instance of this may be cited: This Forty-seventh Congress was famous for filibustering, and when, on one occasion, the majority of Congress determined to discipline the Democrats who had obstructed legislation for a week or more, Carlisle, of Kentucky, in defense quoted from a speech made by Garfield in the Forty-fifth Congress in reference to the rights of the minority. The quotation was most effective, and called forth delighted Democratic applause, but before the echoes had died away Burrows arose and requested Carlisle to read the balance of Garfield's speech. This Carlisle declined to do, so Burrows proceeded to read it for him, showing that Garfield really denounced in the most unequivocal manner, as revolutionary, filibustering in any form which prevented the consideration of any proposition.

The Democratic joy was quickly turned to chagrin.

The sanctity of the ballot box of the South was not yet respected, and the Lowe-Wheeler election contest brought Burrows into the discussion as a revival of his earlier fight on the security of elections. Here, however, he applied himself not to the specific case but to the basic principles upon which it rested. "When any man," he said, "whoever he may be, steals to the ballot box, where reposes the defenseless offering of a Nation's sovereign power, and takes its life, he is an assassin whose crime cannot be expiated. This Republic can withstand the shock of revolution; it can overcome invasion of a foreign foe; it can endure the murder of its executive head; but it cannot long survive the assassination of its sovereign will."

Later, referring to this subject in a campaign speech, he made telling use of facts which had come to light:

"At Hope Engine polling house, in the city of Charleston," Burrows said, "the poll list kept by the Democratic managers of the election, the list kept by the Democratic United States Supervisor, and the list kept by the Republican United States Supervisor, substantially agreed. One of them said that 1218 men had voted, the other said that 1214 had voted; this was the only difference between them. Taking the name of every voter as he deposited his ballot,

the list only differed four names. Either 1214 or 1218 men had voted. Now, after every vote had been cast, you would expect to find in that box either 1214 or 1218 ballots; but at sundown, when the proclamation was made that the poll had closed, the box was opened, the ballots put upon the table and counted, and there were found to be just 2289 votes. It was not much of a day for voting either. Just 1071 more votes in the box than there were voters all told! The Democratic Party of this Nation declared, 'You shall not exercise your right to inquire into that practice.' Another peculiar thing about the count, or about the ballots, was this: that of the 2289 votes in the box, 1683 were straight Democratic ballots. This was 465 more Democratic votes in the ballot box than there were voters in the polling place. Yet the Democratic Party said, 'You shall not inquire into this matter.' They said, 'We will do the fair thing, and we will draw out the excess to show the people that we take no unfair advantage.' So they blindfolded a Democrat and told him to draw. That was not fair. What ought to have been done in that case was to paralyze the Democrat so that he could not feel, as one of the ballots was wider than the other. But, to make a show of honesty, they blindfolded him, and then allowed him to draw out the ballots. When put on the stand, he testified that

he drew out every Republican ballot except two. They asked him why he did not draw those out, and he said he could not find them. Yet the National Democratic Party declares, 'You shall not inquire into such a case, you shall not consider it.' "

When Burrows referred to "the murder of the Republic's executive head," he had in mind the recent tragedy of Garfield's assassination. His relations with the Ohio statesman had ripened into the closest friendship during the years they were together in the House, and Garfield's death was a personal blow from which he was slow to recover.

The first Bill which Burrows personally brought to the attention of the House was that to prevent patent rights extortion, which was of particular importance to the farmers. There existed at this time a well-organized system of blackmail whereby innocent purchasers of patented articles throughout the Western States were subjected to damage suits brought by parties whose claims to the patents were never established. A farmer would purchase barbed wire, driven-well cases, and other farm necessities from traveling salesmen, and later, agents of the so-called owners of the patent rights would appear, demanding back royalties. In the majority of cases the farmers were unable successfully to defend what they believed to be their rights, and were forced to submit

to unwarranted levies. The Burrows' Bill for their protection was passed, and proved of great value to the agricultural interests of the country.

It was, however, the Edmunds Anti-Polygamy Bill which most attracted Burrows' interest, and it was in this session that he sounded the first note of constructive antagonism to Mormonism which culminated in his masterly handling of the famous Smoot case in the Senate many years later.¹ The discussion started on a question as to the legal right of Campbell, of Utah, to take his seat in the House with the credentials which he presented; but Burrows saw an opportunity to strike Mormonism a decisive blow, and he was not slow to follow up his advantage. He introduced a Bill providing that no man guilty of bigamy or polygamy should be eligible to a seat in the House. This Bill was not popular from a Democratic standpoint, and the Democrats had no idea of permitting it to pass. Burrows, however, was more than a match for them. On the first Monday of each month, after the call of States and Territories for the introduction of Bills had been concluded, an opportunity was offered in the House for individual members to ask the passage of their favorite measures under the suspension of the rules. Immediately after the call, Burrows arose to move a suspension of the rules for

¹ See Volume II, Chapter V.

the purpose of passing his Anti-Polygamy Bill. The House had apparently forgotten that this was suspension day, and several members exclaimed that the Bill could not be passed except by unanimous consent. Availing himself of this lack of watchfulness, Burrows moved a suspension of the rules. His motion was seconded by more than the required majority, and this being carried by almost a unanimous vote, the Bill was declared passed in less than five minutes. Burrows did not even make his fifteen minute speech on the Bill, fearing that if he did so he would arouse the House, and incur an opposition which might be disastrous. Bragg, of Wisconsin, was waiting until the vote should be taken to suspend the rules, it then being his intention to offer an amendment as the basis of filibustering. To his chagrin, however, Bragg was informed by the Speaker that he was too late,—the passage of the motion to suspend the rules in the form it was put had also passed the Bill. Randall, Cox, and Springer all happened to be out of the Chamber at this time or it might not have been so easy to catch the Democrats in a parliamentary blunder, but the Republicans were not slow to recognize in Burrows' clever tactics the work of a parliamentarian of the first order. Schuyler Colfax telegraphed Burrows just after this incident, "Congratulations. You hit the nail on the head. Hammer it home."

In 1881 Burrows was honored by being invited to deliver the Decoration Day address at Gettysburg, where seventeen years earlier Lincoln had spoken his immortal words. It was an address in keeping with the high standards established by his predecessors, scholarly in its conception, appropriate in its nature, and eloquent in its tribute. In closing he said:

“Upon these headstones, the white leaves of an ever-open volume, are recorded the names and deeds of those who perished on this sanguinary field. These records will fade and crumble into decay, yet so long as constitutional government has a champion, the Union an advocate, liberty a friend,—so long shall the memory of their achievements be preserved to inspire and bless mankind.”

Another admirable example of Burrows' eloquence is found in his address this same year in Milwaukee on the occasion of the opening of the Industrial Exposition, when he said, referring to the Pantheon which was that day opened:

“Dedicate it to Agriculture, for she has subdued your broad acres, billowed them with harvests bearing plenty to your hearthstones and treasures to your coffers.

“Dedicate it to Commerce, for she gathers the riches of every clime, and lays them in royal munificence at your feet.

“Dedicate it to Manufactures, for with cunning hand she ministers in tireless vigilance to the comfort and necessities of mankind.

“Dedicate it to Science, for, in the language of Macaulay, ‘It has lengthened life; it has mitigated pain; it has extinguished diseases; it has increased the fertility of the soil; it has given new securities to the mariner; it has furnished new arms to the warrior; it has spanned great rivers and estuaries with bridges of form unknown to our fathers; it has guided the thunderbolt harmlessly from heaven to earth; it has lighted up the night with the splendor of the day; it has extended the range of human vision; it has multiplied the power of the human muscles; it has accelerated motion; it has annihilated distance; it has facilitated intercourse, correspondence, all friendly offices, all despatch of business; it has enabled man to descend to the depths of the sea, to soar into the air, to penetrate securely into the noxious recesses of the earth, to traverse the land in cars and cross the ocean in ships. These are but a part of its fruits, and of its first fruits; for it is a philosophy which never rests, which has never attained, which is never perfect; its law is progress. A point which was yesterday invisible is its goal today, and will be its starting point tomorrow.’

“Dedicate it to Art, for she is immortal. ‘When I think,’ said an old monk, who was accustomed to show the paintings on the walls of his monastery, ‘how men come generation after generation to see these pictures, and how they pass away but these remain, I sometimes think that these are the realities, and we are the shadows.’

“Dedicate it to Music, for her voice can arouse the slumbering energies of the Nation, still the tempests in the human breast, and break to mortal ear the very harmonies of heaven.

“Dedicate it to the Genius of Invention, for it has lifted the burdens from the back of toil, wiped the sweat from the brow of labor, and gladdened the whole earth with the trophies of its triumphs.

“And, finally, dedicate it to the lofty spirit of Progress, whose shibboleth is borne on your great seal of State, ‘Forward and forever.’ ”

At the close of the Forty-seventh Congress Burrows again, for a single term, dropped out of the House of Representatives. He had been unanimously renominated for the Forty-eighth Congress, but the unpopularity of his Party, discontent over Federal patronage, the candidacy on the Union ticket of the brilliant Yapple, combined with some curious local conditions accomplished his defeat.

Burrows probably did not recognize that this second temporary setback in his political career was another blessing in disguise. From a personal standpoint, it gave him opportunity to reflect both upon himself and upon the Party of which he now knew himself to be an integral factor. It gave him opportunity to get back again into the heart of his constituency, and to learn as a layman what the people really thought and really felt. There is an advantage which comes from continuous service, and this advantage was to come to Burrows later; but it is also beneficial, particularly in the early part of any man's career, to have the opportunity offered him to consider himself and his actions from an impersonal standpoint and away from actual activity. Too often a man comes too close to his work, and thus fails to attain the best of which he is capable. Success is often taken as a measure of approval, and the contentment which comes with this too often prevents the highest development because of the absence of immediate necessity of effort.

If Burrows had not been defeated in 1881 he would have entered the Blaine campaign as a part of the machine rather than as a contestant for election, and the lessons he learned at this crisis were of inestimable value to his later work. If he had not been defeated he would not have learned how highly his

Party had already come to think of him, as evidenced by the efforts made by influential statesmen to reward him for his past services with some public office. He was suggested and urged for Postmaster General, as Second Comptroller of the Treasury, as First Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and as Chief Justice or Governor of Dakota. He permitted no one of these suggestions, however, to come to a head, and when President Arthur appointed him Solicitor of the Treasury, and even went so far as to forward to him the official appointment, he steadfastly declined to accept any responsibility which would stand in the way of his return to the House of Representatives. His confidence that this was to be his life work was no less than when ten years earlier he had seen himself temporarily set aside.

So, after taking a brief vacation in Dakota, he returned to Kalamazoo and to the practice of his profession, reëstablishing the old law firm of Severens & Burrows which had been dissolved when he entered Congress in 1872. In the meantime, Mr. Severens had added largely to his legal attainments by his experience on the bench, and the new firm immediately took its position as one of the strongest in the State.

It is interesting to compare Burrows' speeches in his own campaign for reëlection and in behalf of

Blaine's candidacy for President with those of his earlier campaigns. We have already noted how the ornate, grandiloquent style of the youthful orator passed away and settled upon a more permanent basis; the third epoch begins with this period. What may be called the second epoch showed Burrows as a skilful campaigner, knowing his audiences and swaying them by his combination of eloquence and academic presentation of the facts. Now, however, we see the academician turned into the simple exponent, leading his audiences as well as persuading, and showing them almost in words of one syllable the merits of his cause. Too often we find an orator influenced by his audience; too often he strives for applause by advocating theories which he finds are popular: "If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue," is Kipling's way of putting it. Burrows always dominated his hearers, and scrupulously adhered to his basic principles.

The clarity and simplicity of his diction, however, did not detract from his reputation for eloquence. It simply meant that he had become more versatile and more accomplished in making his speeches fit their respective audiences. When it came to his Memorial Address, delivered on the occasion of the death of General Grant, he was again the orator, with the same wonderful vocabulary at his command, the

same magnetic presence, the same effective voice, the same compelling style:

“He goes to his grave,” Burrows said, “stripped of the very sword with which he defended his country that he might make reparation for the wrongs of others. But he sleeps well. Would that he could have been accorded life’s allotted span, but he lived long enough to see his country happily reunited in the bonds of enduring peace. He lived long enough to see the banner of the Republic everywhere respected, beneath which there breathed no master and crouched no slave. He lived long enough to see the sunlight of truth break through and dispel the mists that sometimes threatened to envelop his fair name. He lived long enough to be assured of the undying gratitude of the Republic and the immortality of his fame. He lived long enough to see the bitterness engendered by our civil strife so far assuaged that those who had been his foes in war were his friends in peace. And today, as Union and Confederate Generals unite with a common sorrow in bearing his body to its final resting-place, methinks if he could speak from the beyond he would again exclaim, ‘Let us have Peace.’ And so the great soul of this uncrowned king, with the benediction of all the people, has passed through the earthly dawn into the dawn eternal.”

Burrows was a delegate-at-large to the National Republican Convention of 1884, and had the satisfaction of seeing Blaine, his friend and Party idol, at last nominated for the Presidency. He had shared Blaine's disappointment over his defeat in the Convention of 1876; he had been torn by the tempestuous scenes of the Convention of 1880, when Conkling, supporting Grant for a third term, had locked horns with the Blaine forces until Garfield was nominated as a compromise candidate. Garfield was a more intimate friend than Blaine, but Burrows knew, as did all the world, that Blaine was better fitted by nature and by experience for the responsibilities of the high office. In 1884, however, Fate seemed to relent, and the Maine statesman was at last given the banner of the Party which he had so long and so efficiently served.

Burrows threw himself with undisguised joy into the campaign. After stumping the State of Iowa with Benjamin Harrison, he made a two weeks' canvass with Blaine in the nominee's own State, later speaking throughout New York, and closing the campaign in Michigan. The Party platform was loosely constructed, including Protection, the control of corporations through the strict regulation of Inter-state Commerce, and Civil Service Reform, and the Democrats were still charged with ballot frauds in the

South. Owing to the confused estimate of Blaine's character, held even by Republicans, as a result of the personal attacks made upon him, and to the unusual personal popularity of Cleveland, the campaign speakers confined themselves closely to the National problems which each espoused. The fact that the Democrats skilfully evaded the whole question of Protection in their platform marked a significant landmark in the history of that Party.

Burrows' attack was made principally against this seemingly weakest point in their armor. He was particularly successful in pointing out the tortuous course pursued by the Democratic Party, showing how it had doubled on itself, and was at that moment on a "straddle." Although varied in its presentation and emphasized more in some speeches than in others, the basis of his remarks on this point may be found in an earlier speech made before Congress, which tersely summarizes the gymnastics to which he referred. In this speech he says:

"It is one of the peculiarities of modern Democracy that the principles it avowed yesterday it repudiates today. The cause it espouses today it will abandon tomorrow. Indeed, it may well be questioned whether as a Party it has any fixed and abiding convictions. Its history for the last twenty-five years is a history of vacillation, insincerity, and folly. In

1872 it demanded a speedy return to specie payments; in 1876 it denounced the Resumption Act and demanded its repeal. In 1868 it demanded the payment of the interest-bearing obligations of the Government in irredeemable paper; in 1872 it denounced repudiation in every form and guise. In 1868 it demanded the abolition of all instrumentalities designed to secure negro supremacy; in 1872 it recognized the equality of all men before the law, of whatever race or color. From 1860 to 1865 it wielded its Party power to obstruct the successful prosecution of the war for the Union; in 1882 it proclaimed itself the chief instrument in accomplishing its successful results. In 1868 it publicly thanked Andrew Johnson for exercising the veto power in resisting the aggressions of Congress; in 1880 it declared that the use of the veto power insults the people and imperils their institutions. In 1860 it drove labor to the shambles and sold it at public auction; in 1880 it declared itself the friend of the laboring-men. In 1868 it was for a Democrat for President; in 1872 it enlisted under the banner of a Republican. In war it followed the leadership of a peace general; in peace it supported a general who was for war. One of your own number, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. Upson, has fitly characterized the course of the Democratic Party

as follows: 'It can succeed,' he says—"if the Democratic Party will be true to its time-honored principles, true to itself, shake off its spell of vacillation and lethargy, cease its cowardly trimming at every doubting whisper, quit dodging at every flitting shadow, stop tweedling every political crank, and drag itself from the meshes of that drag-net policy thrown out to catch the followers of every new-fangled ism and popular whim.' And so the Democratic Party, for a quarter of a century, without chart or compass, has been cruising in every sea, intent upon and anxious only to avail itself of any breeze from any quarter that might fill its sails and carry it into political power. I thank God that I belong to a Party that in storm or sunshine has kept steadily on its course."

On the stump, he told this anecdote with telling effect: "The Democratic Party as a Party has no settled convictions on this subject of finance. They are soft money in one State, and hard money in another; soft one day and hard another. They are like the fellow who had a horse which he recommended as a hunter. A stranger came along and noticed that once in a while his horse would drop down, and he said, 'What is the matter with the horse?' The fellow said, 'That is a trick; there is deer around. He is a setter, and when he smells deer around he

will always do that. He is a very valuable horse.' The stranger said, 'How will you trade?' and he bought the horse and started out with it, and he came along to the middle of a stream and the horse dropped. With that he was a little disgusted, and went back and said that he had been cheated. 'What is the matter?' asked the seller; 'didn't he drop?' 'Yes, he did; right in the midst of a stream, and I came near getting drowned.' 'Well,' said the former, 'I forgot to tell you, that horse is just as good for trout as he is for deer.' So the Democratic Party is just as good for soft money as it is for hard money."

The results of his campaign work were strongly apparent in the State elections. He was called by Cameron to Pennsylvania and by Colfax to Indiana. "You have just stolen the hearts of our people," Colfax wrote, "and they rank you as even more effective than Ingersoll." "Your magnificent speech," wrote M. C. Dunning from Iowa, "turned the scale. . . . That speech is still the favorite topic among Republicans here, and is regarded as the most brilliant and most effective ever delivered in Mitchell County."

His own victory scarcely made up to Burrows for the keenness of his disappointment over the defeat of his leader, although Blaine himself had never been sanguine of success from the time he was first nominated in 1876. After the Cincinnati Convention

Blaine had exclaimed: "I am the Henry Clay of the Republican Party,—I can never be President"; and the strange fatality which followed him in thwarting this one great desire of his life culminated in this defeat.

It was at this time that Ingersoll sent Burrows the following amusing comments on recent events:

From Robert G. Ingersoll

WASHINGTON, D. C., Dec. 20, '84

MY DEAR BURROWS:

After congratulating you on your election, and after my best regards to Mrs. Burrows, I will say. . . . How is the world going? What do you think of the late alleged election? What is your opinion of the preacher in politics? What do you think of Balaam's ass and Blaine's doctor of divinity?

This is a great world, brother Burrows, and many things are foretold that never happen, and some things come to pass without being foretold. . . .

CHAPTER VII

LATER YEARS IN THE LOWER HOUSE. 1885-1890

WITH his election to the Forty-ninth Congress, Burrows began a continuous service of twenty-seven years in the Lower and Upper branches. He found a substantial Democratic majority in the House and a Republican Senate, which formed a combination hostile to important legislation. Civil Service Reform was the shibboleth of the period, owing to the tremendous expansion of the "spoils system" which had culminated in the murder of President Garfield. Cleveland himself recognized the temper of the people, and for the first time in over fifty years the incoming President made no radical sweep in the non-political offices. The hope which this engendered in the hearts of the advocates of Civil Service Reform was, however, soon dispelled, as Cleveland found himself absolutely unable to prevent his Cabinet officers from yielding to the ravenous demands of the hungry Democratic office seekers, who were now in a position to appropriate the spoils of victory.

During the first session of this Congress the question of the Presidential succession was settled, this

action being impelled by the death of vice-President Hendricks. A Tariff Bill was prepared, but as there was no possibility of passing it through the Republican Senate it was never urged for serious consideration. Cleveland coöperated earnestly in the organization of the Civil Service Commission, but, as we shall see later, the sincerity of his efforts in this direction was more than nullified by the lack of coöperation on the part of other influential leaders of his Party.

Although hopelessly in the minority, Burrows was heard on all the important measures which came up during the two sessions. One of these was a Bill submitted for the relief of Major-General Fitz-John Porter, which in effect was an effort to reverse the judgment of the court-martial which dismissed General Porter from the service of the United States in January, 1863, on the ground of "disobedience of the lawful commands of his superior officer" and "misbehavior in the face of the enemy." The Bill had passed the Forty-eighth Congress, but was vetoed by President Arthur. Burrows approached the subject first from a judicial aspect, questioning the authority of Congress to take upon itself the power to set aside, modify, or nullify the sentence of a general court-martial. He presented an impressive array of opinions from legal authorities which carried

much weight; and finally summed up his case with the old-time fire which could only burst from the Northern soldier in contemplating what he considered to be nothing less than Southern treachery. The deep-rooted, war-time antagonisms were still alive in Burrows' breast, even though now under full control.

"Let me say to you, gentlemen," he said—"let me say to the Democratic Party North and South,—South in the lead, the North following, that if by the force of numbers you do this thing the country will not hold you guiltless. The people whom Fitz-John Porter betrayed are content with the verdict. Why not let it stand? Why seek to reverse it? Do you question the capacity or integrity of the court? Fitz-John Porter was tried and convicted by a military tribunal composed of gentlemen of exalted character and acknowledged ability. Six of the nine generals . . . were graduates of the Military Academy, familiar with all the details and discipline of military life. Generals Prentiss and Slough were men of high civil and military renown, while General Garfield, for brilliant achievements in the field and forum, is assigned a foremost place in the Nation's regard.

"Such was the high character of the tribunal which convicted Fitz-John Porter. It sat where the sound of the battle's thunder had been heard, and

summoned into its presence the witnesses, chief and subaltern, from that field of carnage and treachery. It sat with open doors. The accused was present in person and by eminent counsel, among whom was the Hon. Reverdy Johnson. It prosecuted the investigation for forty-five days; examined eighteen persons on the part of the Government and twenty-two on behalf of the accused,—forty witness in all. . . . Judge Holt submitted the case without argument. The accused was heard at length, after which the court found Fitz-John Porter guilty of disobedience of the lawful commands of his superior officer and misbehavior in the face of the enemy; and thereupon sentenced him to be dismissed from the military service of the United States, and forever disqualified from holding any office of profit or trust under the Government thereof. The findings and sentence of the court were approved by Abraham Lincoln, whose name has become a synonym of justice and honesty.

“But it has been said that injustice was done Fitz-John Porter, and that the judgment of the court was swayed by the passions and prejudices of the hour. It is a notorious fact that a majority of that court were Porter’s personal friends, none his enemies. He himself, upon his arraignment, declared himself content with the detail. The sentence of the court gives

assurance of its friendship, for if Fitz-John Porter was guilty of one-half with which he was charged he ought to have paid the forfeit of his life. The blood that courses in his veins is no richer than that which warms the heart of the humblest subaltern, and if a private soldier had been guilty of what Fitz-John Porter was convicted he would have been shot on the field.

“But do you come here for an impartial tribunal? Is there no bias in this panel? At the risk of being charged with reviving the memories of the past, may I inquire if there are not some gentlemen in this array whose cause was directly benefited by Porter’s treachery, and if such, do you think you are or can be impartial judges? Do you believe the betrayer of a public trust should be tried by the parties who profited by the treachery? Is that your idea of an impartial verdict? What a travesty this is upon justice! The beneficiaries of Porter’s crime gravely sit in judgment to condemn Lincoln and Garfield, and acquit Porter! That, too, after twenty-three years, nearly a quarter of a century, has sealed the lips of witnesses and silenced the voice of the court. Why not let this judgment stand? Why seek to reverse it?

“You who are so sensitive about reviving the memories of the past, in the name of peace why not let

this rest? I fear there is but one explanation. Not long since it was proclaimed in this Hall that the 'South would not be content until it had wiped from the statute-book all the war legislation of Abraham Lincoln.' What was then regarded as a harmless outburst of passion seems after all to have been a startling prophecy. The beginning of its fulfilment is at hand. Legislative enactment and solemn adjudication are alike marked for destruction. Where the work is to end Heaven only knows. It looks as if nothing was secure, nothing settled, nothing exempt from this unholy purpose of demolition. But let me say to the majority of this House, and to the Democratic Party, that you are making a fearful mistake in signaling your return to National control by impeaching the honesty of Abraham Lincoln and reversing the judgment of James A. Garfield. Though their lips are sealed, be assured that the people who honored them and their works living will defend them dead. You may enter judgment against them here, but it will be indignantly reversed by the grand as-sizes of the people. I am conscious that we can do little else here than protest against the passage of this measure. In the name of the Constitution which it overrides, of the law which it wantonly violates, of the good order and discipline of the army which it disturbs and destroys, and in the name of the

unnumbered dead who fell a sacrifice to the treachery of Fitz-John Porter, I protest against it."

The Post-office Appropriation Bill afforded Burrows an excellent opportunity to bring out the contrast between the protestations of the Democratic Party in the matter of Civil Service Reform and the actual application of their alleged principles when the opportunity actually came to put them into operation. "If there has been any one thing in the last fifteen years," he said, "to which the Democratic Party seemed more ardently attached than any other it was reform in the Civil Service. In season and out of season, in public and in private, by speech and platform, it has coveted every occasion to make solemn protestation of its devotion to this new-found object of its idolatry. Its enthusiasm at times would brook no restraint.

"Although Reform and the Democratic Party never had any personal acquaintance until 1872, when they met for the first time in a Liberal-Republican Convention, yet from that hour there sprang up an attachment between them which has been absolutely phenomenal. Some slight conception of the warmth of its devotion at that time may be gathered from the following declaration preserved in its platform of 1872:

"The Civil Service of the Government has become

a mere instrument of partisan tryanny and personal ambition, and an object of selfish greed. It is a scandal and reproach upon free institutions, and breeds a demoralization dangerous to the perpetuity of Republican Government. We therefore regard a thorough reform of the Civil Service as one of the most pressing necessities of the hour; that honesty, capacity, and fidelity constitute the only valid claims to public employment; that the offices of the Government cease to be a matter of arbitrary favoritism and patronage, and that public station shall become again a post of honor.’¹

“In 1876 the Democratic Party renewed its vows of fidelity with such earnestness as to banish all thought of the possibility of betrayal, in the following language:

“ ‘Reform is necessary in the Civil Service. Experience proves that efficient, economical conduct of the Governmental business is not possible if its Civil Service be subject to change at every election, be a prize fought for at the ballot-box, be a brief reward for Party zeal, instead of posts of honor assigned for proved competency, and held for fidelity in the public employ; that the dispensing of patronage should neither be a tax upon the time of all our public men, nor the instrument of their ambition.’²

¹ Democratic platform, Baltimore, Md., July, 1872.

² Democratic platform, Saint Louis, Mo., June 27, 1876.

“In 1880, its ardor had somewhat cooled, and was fast settling down into respectful consideration, as the following declaration in its platform discloses: ‘We pledge ourselves to a general and thorough reform of the Civil Service.’

“In 1884, six words, compressed into one curt sentence, measured its waning regard: ‘We favor honest Civil Service reform.’

“But if the public mind had become somewhat distrustful of the sincerity of the Democratic Party in its professions touching reform in the Civil Service, it was fully reassured by Mr. Cleveland in his letter of acceptance, in which he said: ‘The selection and retention of subordinates in Government employment shall depend upon their ascertained fitness and the value of their work. Public employment will be open to all who can demonstrate their fitness to enter it.’ These are some of the professions with which the Democratic Party came up to the campaign of 1884, and under which it was entrusted with National control.

“In view of these utterances the people had a right to expect, and in many instances were undoubtedly deluded into the belief, that the Democratic Party would in good faith redeem its promises in this regard. That, in the language of the Democratic platform, ‘honesty, capacity, and fidelity’ would be the only

valid claims to public employment, and that, in the words of the President, 'the selection and retention of subordinates in the Government employment would depend upon their ascertained fitness.' Indeed, the Democratic Party and its nominee for the Presidency were so completely committed to the doctrine of reform in the Civil Service that there was no escape from the execution of the law in this regard but by public renunciation or secret evasion. The former step would have been commendable in the highest degree in contrast with that other course which this Administration seems determined to pursue. To have failed to execute the law would have been bad faith; to pretend to execute it while secretly nullifying it is not only bad faith but hypocrisy.

"The first intimation of a plan by which the consequences of Democratic professions might be avoided came from Mr. Cleveland in December, 1884, after the service of the people at the ballot-box was no longer required, and nothing remained to complete his title to the Presidency save the formal declaration of the result of the election. Then it was that the President-elect, in a letter to Mr. Curtis,¹ pointed out the way by which the Democratic Party might escape from all its pledges to the people, and fill the public offices with the adherents of the Democratic Party in

¹ George William Curtis.

utter disregard of the letter and spirit of the Civil Service law. I quote from that letter the following:

“There is a class of Government positions which are not within the letter of Civil Service statute, but which are so disconnected with the policy of an Administration that removal therefrom of present incumbents, in my opinion, should not be made during the terms for which they were appointed solely on partisan grounds, and for the purpose of putting in their places those who are in political accord with the appointing power. But many now holding positions have forfeited all just claim to retention, because they have used their places for Party purposes in disregard to their duty to the people, and because, instead of being decent public servants, they have proved themselves offensive partisans and unscrupulous manipulators of local Party management.’

“The term ‘offensive partisan’ makes its appearance in this letter for the first time since the election, and opens a broad avenue for escape from Democratic pledges. *In hoc signo vinces!*

“The Postmaster-general was not slow to seize upon the suggestion of the President-elect, and before he had been in his office sixty days he issued one of the most remarkable letters ever emanating from the head of any Department under any Administration. This

communication¹ is marked 'confidential,' and is signed officially by William F. Vilas, Postmaster-general. . . .

"On the 4th day of March, 1885, the President-elect in his inaugural address declared that 'the people demanded the application of business principles in public affairs,' and that 'Civil Service Reform should be in good faith enforced.' While these high-sounding words were ringing in the public ear, the Postmaster-general is writing a 'confidential' letter to Democratic Congressmen 'to get their cases ready,' and he thought 'from fifteen to twenty-five per cent. of fourth-class postmasters in Ohio might be removed within the next two months.' This is the 'application of business principles to public affairs.' While the echo of these words was yet ringing in the public ear, the Postmaster-general quietly whistles to his side the whole uncounted pack of hungry office-seekers, and sets them upon the track of honest officials with instructions to hunt them down and hold them at bay until the Postmaster-general could take their official life. This is reform in the Civil Service! This is 'doing business behind glass doors.' The whole history of American politics discloses no parallel to this."

¹ Text of letter is given in full in the *Congressional Record*, March 24, 1886.

On May 18, 1886, Burrows spoke on the subject of Foreign Mail Service, pointing out a few of the many inconsistencies in the regulations which controlled the foreign service of the Post-office Department, and particularly urging that \$400,000 extra be appropriated to enable the Postmaster-general to provide adequate service between the United States and Mexico, Central and South America. In view of our present interest in developing relations with South America, it is interesting to see how closely the position taken by Burrows thirty years ago parallels our present convictions. If his amendment had been adopted at that time who shall say how much farther advanced would be the commercial relations today between ourselves and these countries? Quoting from his speech:

“To the New York and Brazilian line, the only line we have running to Brazil, we paid last year \$4,210, and the distance run on a single trip was 5,154 miles, or in a round trip more than 10,000 miles. To Rio and return we paid this line the sum of \$4,210 for the year, or \$326 a trip, or about 3 cents a mile, while at the same time we paid for 246 miles of service from Tampa to Key West \$23,600, or 46 cents a mile. Upon what principle of justice or of reason is this distinction made?

“The ‘Red D line,’ the only line running from New

York to Venezuela, the only steamship flying the American flag in that country, sailed to reach the ports of Venezuela 3,066 miles, in each round trip 6,132 miles, and received \$56.53 a trip, stopping at eight ports, and the owners of that line paid out more to deliver the mail at these eight ports than they received from the Government of the United States for carrying the mails. At the same time we paid a steamship company for carrying the mails from Norfolk to Baltimore, but 200 miles, the sum of \$18,000—more than 15 cents a mile!

“To the New York and Cuban line, running from New York to Cuba, 1,174 miles, we paid a little over \$2,600. That line made seventy-one trips, sailing a total distance of 166,608 miles. And how much did we pay a mile to that line? One cent and a half for carrying the United States mail. At the same time a steamer running from Norfolk to Cape Charles, 38 miles of coastwise service, received \$10,971, or over 39 cents a mile. A cent and a half a mile from New York to Cuba, 1,174 miles, and 40 cents a mile from Norfolk to Cape Charles, 38 miles! We paid the New Orleans and Central American line, running from New Orleans to Nicaragua, 1,065 miles’ distance, making fifteen trips, traveling in the year 40,500 miles—we paid for that service, for carrying the United States mail, going to the post-office in the

United States and getting the mail, taking it to the boat, and delivering it to the post-office in the foreign country, the insignificant sum of \$24.50. It is proposed now to pay these lines a reasonable compensation for carrying the foreign mails, and it is denominated a subsidy! . . .

“Let us look now at the other side of the South American country. From San Francisco to Hongkong, 6,080 miles distant, we paid \$3,506 for last year’s service, eighteen trips, each trip 12,180 miles, the total distance sailed nearly 220,000 miles, and we paid one and one-half cents a mile for that foreign service. At the same time another boat starts from San Francisco and goes to Eureka, on the coast, only 216 miles distant, and we paid that line \$6,500. Why pay for a trip of 12,000 miles \$195 and a trip of 432 miles \$125? . . .

“We paid more for carrying the mails from San Francisco to Sacramento, 171 miles, to wit, \$6,000, than we paid the American line from San Francisco to Hongkong, Panama, and to Mexico. We paid \$6,000 more for carrying the mails from Tacoma to Port Townsend, a distance of 98 miles, than we paid the whole foreign Pacific mail service. We paid as much from Tacoma to Sitka, 1,441 miles, to wit, \$47,700, for carrying the United States mails, as we

paid all the American lines to all foreign ports across both oceans and to the South American countries. And yet no man charges that the compensation from Tacoma to Sitka is a subsidy. I have alluded to these facts for the purpose of showing how unjustly the law of sea and inland postage operates. It is not the fault of any executive officer. It is simply because the law declares that you shall pay to a foreign vessel only the sea postage, and to the American ship the sea and inland postage; and there is nothing under the sun in the amendment of the Senate but the mere saying to the Postmaster-general, 'You shall have the same authority to contract for the foreign service as you now have to contract for domestic service,' and makes an appropriation to carry such contracts into effect. . . .

"We cannot and we must not lose sight of the advantage of connecting this country with the South American republics. The carrying of a single letter to Chili or to the Argentine Republic may lay the foundation of a trade of inestimable value, not to these steamship companies, but to all the American people. Our diversified industries are capable of giving employment to all our laboring people. The field and the factory, the forest and the mine, our facilities for employing labor, are simply boundless,

and yet today a million of our laboring people are out of employment, and the bloody hand of the communist is clutching at the throat of capital.

“We might give employment to this labor if we would. But if we employ this labor, and light the fires of our furnaces and open the mines and set the looms in motion, where shall we dispose of the products? At our very door is the answer. We have the market at hand if we are wise enough to control it. Within a stone’s throw almost, right south of us, is the Republic of Mexico, with its twenty-seven States, with a government patterned after our own, with ten millions and a half of people. . . .

“Who controls the trade of Mexico, lying right upon our border? Spain takes over twenty-six millions of it, Germany over eighteen millions and a half, France nearly sixteen millions, while the United States controls less than ten millions; England takes nine millions, and the Central American countries two and a half millions. So that of this entire trade with Mexico the United States controls but a trifle over one-tenth, while nine-tenths of it is held by foreign countries.

“Take Central America, with its five republics. Those five Central American republics have more trade with England by far—yes, double the trade—than they have with the United States, although they

lie at our very doors, easily accessible from the ports of the Gulf States. Their principal imports are cotton goods. We could furnish every yard of cotton goods that the Central American countries need, but Great Britain in 1880 sold them 31,000,000 yards, while the United States sold them only 688,000 yards—a little over half a million. . . .

“South America imports annually enormous quantities of coal. How much from the United States? None; she brings it from England. Yet our coal mines are running on half time or closed up altogether. Mexico and Central and South America consume annually about \$100,000,000 worth of cotton goods. How much do they buy of Great Britain? Ninety-five per cent., and the other 5 per cent. we share in simply. There is no reason why we should not furnish all her cotton fabrics, and these constitute the wearing apparel of three-fourths of her people. . . .

“To those South American countries we have two lines of steamers—only two. We have one line, the Red D line, running from New York to Venezuela, and another line running from New York and Newport News to Brazil. Outside of these lines there is not a single American steamer entering a port of the South American countries or flying an American flag. The Brazilian line has three steamers, every one of them American built; the Venezuelan line seven,

all of American construction. We thus have ten steamers on two lines running to Venezuela and Brazil, the only two countries of all the South American republics to which our steamers run. And for the mail service to these two countries we paid last year the miserable sum of \$5,603.08. . . . The aggregate amount paid for carrying the mails to Central and South America was \$15,136.16, about the same sum we paid from Louisville, Ky., to Evansville, Ind. This is the extent and amount of compensation paid American steamships for carrying our mails to Central and South America; and if you want to reach any other country in South America today aside from Venezuela and Brazil you must take passage to England and under a foreign flag reach the Argentine Republic, her capital city of Buenos Aires, Uruguay, Chili, or any other of the great eastern or western republics of South America. . . . There is not a line running from the United States down the western shore of South America. Now and then, by a stray sailing vessel, American goods reach her ports, but they are shipped generally to Liverpool and Hamburg and carried under a foreign flag around the Horn. The Royal Mail Steamship Company and French line monopolize this entire trade, and do it not by being paid the sea and inland postage, but are aided by liberal compensation for carrying the mails. How

easily the Pacific Mail Steamship Company could extend her line from Panama down the western coast, but the United States says to her, 'If you take that venture we will give you only the postage on the letters you carry, though these letters may lay the foundation for a great trade with the Republic of Peru.' . . .

"We pay annually to foreign ships for carrying our mails \$280,000. Why not do something for our own lines? Only \$46,000 last year to our own steamship lines. We produce annually eight billions of manufactured goods, seven and a half billions of agricultural products; together, fifteen and a half billions,—and we need a market for our surplus products. Where shall we find it? It lies at our very door. It is amazing to me that when a proposition is made to expend only \$400,000 to existing lines connecting with Central and South America, with China and Japan, and to use another \$400,000 to extend these lines and put on new ones that may serve to connect with other countries and open the ports of the Atlantic and Gulf States to the commerce of the republics of South America—it is amazing, I say, that gentlemen will resist it on either side of the House.

"What object is there in opening the Mississippi River at an expense of twenty, thirty, fifty millions of

dollars, and then permit the commerce she carries to be borne away under foreign flags? What statesmanship is there in this? What sense is there in expending \$450,000 on the harbor of Galveston to give an outlet for commerce, and then say to American lines proposing to carry that commerce, 'We will pay only 5 cents, or the letter postage, for carrying the mails between that harbor and the ports of Central and South America'?

"It has been said this is in the interest of the steamship companies alone. That is not true. That it will advantage them no one can deny, but that they are the only parties to be benefited is wholly groundless. I hold in my hand the manifest of a single steamship, the *Finance*, of the Brazilian line, which sailed from New York on the 28th of February last. What cargo did she have on board? She had on board, going from the United States to those South American countries, \$250,000 worth of American goods,—a quarter of a million dollars' worth of American products on one steamship going to the markets of Brazil. This is a matter that concerns the steamship companies alone? . . .

"I hope this appropriation will be made. I hope my amendment will be adopted, allowing \$400,000 to be used on the present lines, and authorizing the Postmaster-general to use the balance to extend those

lines and to put on new ones. I would not permit England to hold the markets of Mexico, Central and South America, if by paying a liberal compensation to American steamships for carrying the mails I could rescue them from her. This can be done, and by so doing we will reopen our mines, relight our furnaces, dispose of our surplus products, give employment to labor and investment to capital, and augment the prosperity of the Nation on the land and her prowess upon the sea."

By far the most important measure of the Forty-ninth Congress was the establishment of a commission to enforce the Inter-state Commerce Act, which forbade discrimination in freight charges, pooling, and rebating. We should remember that Burrows, in 1874, was one of the first to expound the rights and limitations of Congress as applied to Inter-state Commerce.¹ He was peculiarly fitted, therefore, to take part in this discussion, and contributed important data to the debate. In closing, he said: "It is well, in taking possession of this new field of National occupancy, that we move with extreme caution. We are on the border of an unexplored territory, and every step is fraught with momentous consequences. Vast interests are involved. In redressing wrongs we must invade no right, and advance with such

¹ See page 152.

prudence and consideration that in the end our National domination over this great question will be to all a National blessing."

The work of the Fiftieth Congress was comparatively unimportant, but the Mills Bill, which was proposed as the Democratic contribution to Tariff legislation, gave Burrows an opportunity to demonstrate his value to his Party and to establish himself as one of the foremost champions of Protection in the country. His speech against the Bill attracted National attention, and was considered so important a Republican document that over a hundred thousand copies were distributed as campaign literature. The nature of the Bill is explained and extracts from Burrows' speech are given in a later chapter.¹

The Presidential campaign of 1888 made Tariff its main issue. The political effect of the Mills Bill proved to be far-reaching, and the country was thoroughly aroused from coast to coast. Tariff was the one topic of conversation, and for the first time the Parties were squarely aligned against each other upon this important subject. The Democratic Party wrote into their platform a specific endorsement of the Mills Bill, while the Republicans in their platform declared unequivocally, "We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of Protection. We protest

¹ See Chapter VIII.

against its destruction as proposed by the President and his Party. They serve the interests of Europe; we will support the interests of America. . . . The protective system must be maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by disaster to all interests except those of the usurer and the sheriff. We denounce the Mills Bill as destructive to general business, the labor and the farming interests of the country."

The campaign was bitterly fought between Harrison and Cleveland, and the Democratic candidate suffered from the fact that the public had become convinced that his Party was pointed towards Free Trade. In vain Cleveland protested that it was Tariff revision rather than Free Trade, but his statements were discounted by the over-enthusiasm of certain Democrats, particularly in the South, who made no attempt to conceal their satisfaction over the liberal doctrines he espoused. Harrison, in his letter of acceptance, stated that the campaign was between wide-apart principles rather than between schedules, and referred to those who believed in the Democratic contention that "the tariff is a tax," as "students of maxims, not of markets."

The Republicans won both in the Presidential and Congressional elections, and naturally accepted their victory as a definite verdict in favor of Protection.

Burrows was prominent in the campaign, but, owing to his candidacy for reëlection, confined his activities to political engagements in Michigan and the near-by States. T. B. Reed visited Michigan on his Western campaign tour, and after one of his speeches wrote to Burrows (October 15, 1888): "Your Benton Harbor people gave me a delightful meeting and have treated me royally. I was specially pleased to hear them talk so well of you. You have evidently got where the district is yours heart and soul."

The Fifty-first Congress convened in December, 1889, and promptly found itself in a hard-contested struggle for the Speakership. The candidates narrowed down to Thomas B. Reed of Maine, Joseph G. Cannon of Illinois, David B. Henderson of Iowa, William McKinley, Jr. of Ohio, and Julius C. Burrows of Michigan. Reed and McKinley led in the first ballot, and the contest, as it developed, proved to be between these two, the former finally winning by the majority of a single vote. The qualifications possessed by Burrows for this position may perhaps be shown by quoting from what General Patrick A. Collins, then a Democratic member of Congress, said before the balloting began:

"Of the five candidates, I consider that Mr. Burrows would make the best Speaker, and I know Burrows less than any of the others; but he has the

presence, the voice, the temperament, and the knowledge of parliamentary practice and rules to make him preside over the House in a way that will be eminently satisfactory to his own Party, and win for him the respect of ours. As a good Democrat, I hope to see Burrows defeated. I would rather see Reed in the chair, because he would most likely get his Party in hot water before he had been there very long; or McKinley, because his parliamentary knowledge is extremely limited; or Cannon, because he loses his temper;—but if I were a Republican, and had the good of the Party at heart, I would want to see Burrows made Speaker.”

Robert Graves, a Washington correspondent, in speaking of the intimacy of the friendship between Reed of Maine, Burrows of Michigan, Payne of New York, Dolliver of Iowa, and Boutelle of Maine, narrates the following, which bears upon this contest:

“There was a time when this happy band was in danger of collapse. It was in the Fifty-first Congress, when Reed was candidate for Speaker. He thought the other fellows along with other Republican members were going to join forces in the ensuing Congress for the purpose of making Burrows Speaker. Reed’s pride was so much hurt by this that he threatened to go out of Congress, decline the renomination, and retire to private life. Mr. Dolliver acted

as peacemaker. He invited all hands to dinner, and over the walnuts and the wine every one pledged loyalty to Reed, and the determination of that gentleman to retire to private life was withdrawn. DOLLIVER's little dinner may have changed the history of the Republican Party."

Reed's personal qualities made him one of the most powerful and brilliant Speakers in the history of Congress, and the firmness with which he ruled produced a well-organized and constructive body out of a demoralized House. He broke all precedents by declaring that the Speaker of the House was authorized to count as making for a quorum every Representative present in the Chamber, whether he answered to roll-call or not. The Democrats protested angrily against this arbitrary ruling, but Reed's action so hastened the transaction of business and so prevented filibustering that the Democrats themselves, when later in power, adopted what became known as the "Reed rule." This made the Speaker of the House virtually a dictator, and, after the President, the most powerful man in the Federal Government.

Speaker Reed promptly appointed his rival for the Speakership, William McKinley, Jr., of Ohio, as Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and Burrows was named second on that Committee. It was an exceptionally strong body, including, besides

these two, Thomas M. Bayne of Pennsylvania, Nelson Dingley, Jr., of Maine, Joseph McKenna of California, Sereno E. Payne of New York, Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin, John H. Gear of Iowa, John G. Carlisle of Kentucky, Roger Q. Mills of Texas, Benton McMillin of Tennessee, Roswell P. Flower of New York, and Clinton R. Breckinridge of Arkansas. To this body of men was entrusted the task of framing what became the famous McKinley Bill,¹ and in this framing Burrows played an important part. McKinley himself said: "No man's thought and labor did more for the Tariff Bill of 1890 than did that of Mr. Burrows. For months he gave it his almost undivided time and attention. He is the member most valued and appreciated by the Committee."

¹ See Chapter IX.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PROTECTIONIST. 1885-1888

A STUDENT could find no better source of information on the subject of Protection philosophy in the United States than the speeches made by Burrows during his campaigns and on the floor of the House and the Senate. It was a subject which early attracted his interest, and to it he devoted over thirty years of painstaking study and investigation. As a result of this, his knowledge on Tariff problems was second to none, and as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means from 1887 to 1895, and, later, of the Senate Finance Committee, he found ample opportunity for its application. The minority members of the Committee were given no opportunity even to consider the Mills Bill until it was presented to the House, but in the substitute Bill, upon which the Republicans worked while waiting for the restoration of their Party to power, and out of which the McKinley Bill evolved, Burrows took prominent part both in its construction and in its defense.

Burrows embraced the doctrine of Protection, together with thousands of other Republicans, before

it became so powerful an ally of the capitalists, and remained loyal to its creed because he believed in it, and because the Party which always stood as its sponsor was the champion of so many questions of great National importance. More than this, to many it would have seemed unpatriotic, almost treasonable, during the years immediately following the Civil War, to have advocated Free Trade, for that had been the policy of the slaveholders' Party. And, finally, Burrows had seen with his own eyes the unparalleled prosperity which came to industry and commerce from the application of this principle.

At the time when Alexander Hamilton made the first formal defense of Protection, in his famous report on manufactures, there was no danger of having tariff duties manipulated in favor of special interests, because manufactures scarcely existed. The early idea of Protection was to create and foster rather than to protect. If manufacturing interests sprang into existence as a result of this paternal influence, a demand would naturally arise for the consumption of raw material. Furthermore, the Federal Government needed an income which should be independent of the States, and a discriminating duty upon imports was a much more popular method of securing this than a direct tax upon the people. All American citizens felt the importance of becoming industrially

independent if the Nation was to become great.

While it was generally understood that when the infant industries became established upon a firm basis all duties might be abolished, circumstances combined to commit the Federal Government to a definite policy of Protection. With the establishment of Free Trade between the States, and the discriminating duties upon imports, came a prosperity beyond all expectations. The struggle between France and England from 1806 to 1812, followed by our own war with England, destroyed American commerce and forced the country to become commercially self-reliant. At the close of the war, the United States was literally swamped by the importation of foreign goods, and self-preservation brought into existence a powerful capitalistic Party, which supported the Federal Government in maintaining and advancing its protective policy.

When the Civil War broke upon the country, the Federal Government was taxed to the utmost to develop every possible source of revenue, and the capitalistic Party found ready listeners at Washington to its suggestion of still further increasing import duties. England's sympathy with the South, imperfectly concealed, was so obvious an effort to reduce this country to a position where she should produce raw materials only, thus destroying American compet-

ing manufactures, that another powerful argument was added in favor of Protection. After the success of the Northern armies it was never forgotten that written into the Constitution of the Confederate States were clauses forbidding Congress "to appropriate money for any internal improvement intended to facilitate commerce," and prescribing that "no bounties shall be granted from the Treasury, nor shall any taxes on imports from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of domestic industry."

After the Civil War the country turned rapidly from agriculture to manufactures, and the capitalistic Party gained in strength and aggressiveness. Those engaged in the production of raw materials, quick to see the advantages accruing to the manufacturers, demanded equal protection for themselves, and received the forced support of the now "favored class." In order to justify this, it was argued that foreign trade was at best an evil to be diminished to as great an extent as possible; that high prices should be maintained in order to permit high wages; that the home market should be protected for home products.

The Republican Party at its birth stood for Protection, and whether willingly or not this principle was stamped indelibly upon its standard by the circumstances already cited. It was the Republican Party

which preserved the Union, which maintained the payment of State and National debts, and in this way it gained prestige which reflected credit upon all its tenets. During its administration National and international relations prospered, and the tendency of the country was unquestionably in the direction of capitalistic development,—the railroads and the canals opened up the great natural resources to the people, the National expansion of free education made that people competent to receive the benefits. It is not strange that Burrows should have been staunch in his conviction that Protection was one of the greatest boons his Party had conferred upon his country, or that he should have proved so able an exponent and defendant of the principle itself.

Until the nomination of Grover Cleveland in 1884 for the Presidency of the United States, the long supremacy of the Republican Party precluded any danger of having the principle seriously undermined; the discussion related simply to the means and method of arranging the tariff. Burrows, therefore, had little occasion to express himself forcefully upon this particular phase of Republicanism until he found himself, with his fellow-Republicans, face to face with the real issue of Protection against Free Trade in this Presidential campaign. On October 20, 1884, he made an address before the Michigan farmers, and

explained the importance of Protection in its relation to agriculture. It is an excellent example of his methods of expounding the doctrines in which he believed:

“It must be apparent to every one,” he said, “that in some way we must meet the annual expenses of this Government. No one would think it wise or prudent, no one would call it good statesmanship, not to provide for these yearly expenses. It is estimated that it takes some \$300,000,000. With a population of 50,000,000 people, if we should resort to direct taxation it would compel every man, woman, and child in this Republic to pay \$6 apiece annually. We do not collect this revenue by direct taxation, but we collect it by the imposition of the tariff, and the imposition of a direct tax on the people would certainly be very unpopular and end in revolution. So the fathers, at the time of the foundation of the Republic, wisely determined to resort to the method of indirect taxation, or the imposition of duties on imported goods, as the best means of raising the requisite amount to defray the expenses of the Government. The first Congress, at its first session under the Constitution of the United States, passed as its second Act a measure imposing duties on foreign imports; and the first Act signed by George Washington, saving the Act regulating the oath of office, was

an Act imposing duty, or a tariff, on imported goods. From the foundation of the Government till this very moment there has never been a year or a month, or an hour when this policy has been abandoned. All Parties, at all times, have insisted on a tariff. The exact point of difference then, today, between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party is this: the Democratic Party insists that in its imposition no regard shall be had to domestic industries, no regard had to domestic labor, no regard had to National prosperity; but duties shall be imposed solely with the view of collecting a sufficient amount to defray the expenses of the Government.

“A tariff for revenue only,—what is it? A fair illustration would be the imposition of a duty on coffee, tea, indigo; things not produced in this country and which cannot be produced in this country. The revenue derived from this source would be purely and strictly a revenue tariff. It could have no element of protection in it, because there is no domestic industry of the kind to be protected.

“The Republican Party takes clear and sharp issue with the Democratic Party on that question, and says, ‘No; do not make this imposition of duty on articles not produced in this country. Let tea, coffee, things not produced here, come in free; but impose this duty on articles that we do produce or can produce’: and

the Party affirms that by so doing we will accomplish a double purpose. First, we shall raise the necessary revenue to meet the annual expenses of the Government, and we shall do a further and a better thing,—we shall encourage, foster, and build up domestic industries, and give employment to American capital and protection to American labor. . . .

“I suppose that every farmer will concede that he does not till the soil for the pleasure of it. He labors not only to provide for his own family, for his own wants, but to accumulate a competence for his declining years. To accumulate that competence it is necessary for him to have a market for his surplus products. It is of the highest importance to the farmer that his markets shall be as near to his farm as possible, and the nearer his market can be brought to his farm the more valuable will be his products. No one can question that. It follows, therefore, that if you had to rely entirely on a foreign market for the sale of your surplus products the value of them would be very largely diminished, for the cost of transportation comes out of the value of the product as you take it from the farm. . . .

“Secondly, a protective tariff benefits the farmer in giving him a steady market. What the farmer wants, quite as much as a market, is a steady market, so that when he sows his broad acres in the Fall he may know

in advance that he can reap with profit. Suppose we had no consuming class in the United States, and the farmer had to depend upon the foreign market for the sale of his surplus product. One year there would be a dearth in Europe, and she would take all the surplus products of the farms of the United States. Then the farmer, trusting upon that market, would sow broader fields, and lay the foundation for richer harvests; but the next year comes and the harvests are bountiful in Europe, and Europe at once says to the farmers of the United States, 'We have no use for your surplus products,' and the wheat and the corn rot in the stack or in the crib.

"But a protective tariff benefits the farmer in the third place, by increasing the value of his farm lands. The value of his farm products is not only increased by this home market, but the value of the farm itself is enhanced by building up manufacturing industries. I do not make this statement without knowing whereof I affirm. If I should call the roll of States, you would be amazed to find that in those States where manufacturing is the greatest the value of farm lands is the highest, and in those States where manufacturing is the least the value of farm lands is the least. . . .

"But a protective tariff benefits the farmer in other ways. It gives a market for the farmer for things

that he could not otherwise dispose of, and which on his farm he regards as substantially valueless. . . .

“There is another industry affected by the tariff in which the farmer is specially interested. I allude to the wool industry. The sheep growers of this district, and of the whole country, are deeply interested in the wool industry of the United States. It sprang into existence under a protective tariff. The farmers have invested in their flocks the accumulation of long years. They were led to do this by the protection of this industry, and we have reached a point in 1884 when the destruction of this industry is seriously threatened. . . . More than a million men are today flock-masters in the United States. These flocks are increasing not only in number, but in quality. If this industry is not protected it certainly will go to the wall. The wool-growers of the United States cannot compete with the wool-growers of South America and Australia. In the first place, take the Australian wool,—it is just as good a wool, if not better, than you can grow. They are increasing their flocks of sheep beyond all calculations. They herd them on lands which they rent by the year for a penny an acre. They have no sheds or barns, for it is perpetual summer. They shear the sheep twice a year. They feed them nothing in the Winter, for there is no Winter;

and they can grow that wool and lay it down in your market, at a profit, for twelve or fifteen cents a pound. Where is there a wool-grower in my hearing this afternoon who is prepared to say that it would pay him to continue in the wool industry if wool was only twelve or fifteen cents a pound? Free trade in wool would simply drive your flocks to the slaughter pens." . . .

By electing Cleveland the country seemed to express its desire to test out more liberal trade conditions as against Protection. Whatever may have been Cleveland's personal attitude in the matter of tariff, he found himself confronted by a serious problem. The excess of receipts over expenditures was placing the Administration in a really dangerous position; tax reduction could not be secured, and the President failed to come to any agreement with his Party on expenditures, the net result being that the Treasury Department had no alternative other than to store up its funds or to buy bonds in the open market. For the Treasury to retain one year's surplus revenue meant that the monetary circulation must be reduced at least one-twelfth, and such a contraction made a financial crisis not only possible but probable. Cleveland became convinced that tax reduction was absolutely imperative, declaring that his position was taken on the ground of excess revenue



GILLAM CARTOON FROM "JUDGE;" "THERE'S A NIGGER IN THE WOOD-PILE!"

only, and not necessarily in opposition to the protective system. He further suggested that these reductions be made upon necessities rather than upon luxuries.

Suffering from a lack of financial leadership in the House, the Democratic Party floundered about trying to find a way out of their difficulty. William R. Morrison of Illinois, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, introduced various Tariff measures, but failed to secure the support even of his own Party. Cleveland continued to bring pressure to bear upon Congress, doing his best to educate his Party, his efforts culminating in his annual message of December, 1887, which was devoted entirely to revenue reform. In spite of the fact that Cleveland always disavowed the imputation of being a Free-Trader, this message was accepted as nothing less than a Free Trade document, and the President was immediately placed in the ranks of the pronounced Tariff Reformers.

Roger Q. Mills of Texas had now become Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and to him was entrusted the task of formulating a Tariff Bill which should accomplish the ideas which the President advocated. When this document, known as the Mills Bill, was finally presented to the House, it brought forth one of the most remarkable debates in the

history of Congress. It consumed a record amount of time, and its political effect was tremendously far-reaching. In it the revision reached every schedule of the tariff, but it was inconsistent in its relation to different industries, and, taken as a whole, could not be considered as successful in accomplishing the reduction which was the reason for its consideration. It was decidedly sectional in its nature, sacrificing the protection of certain industries which flourished in Republican States while giving protection to industries which were already prospering in Democratic States. The methods employed in preparing the Bill were also open to criticism, as the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means were kept entirely in the dark until the Bill itself was reported to the House. The Mills Bill was finally passed through the House by a narrow margin, but received its death blow in the Republican Senate; so that its greatest importance may be said to have been its effect upon the campaign of 1888.

A spectator, seated in the diplomatic gallery, has recorded the following graphic description of the scene in the House when Burrows delivered his speech against the Bill:

“Every seat, above and below, was occupied, and every inch of standing room to the doors. On the Democratic side members appeared busy, some writ-

ing, some reading papers which were uneasily and frequently turned as if their readers were unable to find anything of interest. Their ears were evidently more attent than their eyes. Every word that fell from the speaker's lips was caught with earnest interest by every person in the Hall of Congress. The suppressed excitement was intense. When Mr. Burrows reached the closing portion of his speech and touched on the South, laying aside his notes and stepping from the side of his desk, the members on the other side who had feigned giving attention to other things, turned. Papers were dropped. Pens with their tiny store of ink remained idle in the hand. The speech closed amidst a tremendous outburst from the crowds assembled. The throng rushed for the speaker,—friends who admired and sympathized with the sentiments of the speech, not unmingled with opponents who admired its candor and brilliance. Mr. Burrows was overwhelmed with congratulations."

The following extracts from this speech show the results of the thoroughgoing and consistent thought Burrows gave to the subject of Tariff legislation:

"That the accumulation of such a surplus must be averted there can be no question. A constantly-accruing and ever-increasing surplus not only invites to profligacy, but insures swift financial disaster. There can be, therefore, no conflict of opinion but

that there must be such a modification of our tax laws as will insure a reduction of revenue to the basis of probable Governmental expenditure. This would seem to be a problem easily solved; and indeed its solution would be attended with little difficulty if no other result was to be obtained than a reduction of the surplus. In each case it would only be necessary to ascertain the sources of revenue, and then cut off indiscriminately sufficient to insure the desired result. But a reduction of the revenue is not the only nor indeed the chief end to be attained. The method by which that reduction is to be accomplished has become the main point of controversy, and, indeed, the only point about which there is any serious conflict of opinion. Shall the proposed reduction be taken from internal or from customs revenues, or from both; and if from both, in what proportion from each? These are the questions of chief concern, and here Parties divide and here the conflict begins.

“What is the occasion for this division—why this conflict? It is this: we derive our revenues from two sources, internal taxation and a tax on imports. Our tariff on imports is today confessedly protective in that it is levied not with a view to raising ‘revenue only’ but to protect American labor and encourage American industries. The Democratic Party, or at least one wing of it under the leadership of President

Cleveland, assails this system, denouncing it as 'vicious and illogical,' and declares it to be not only unwise but unconstitutional; that duties on imports should be levied, in the language of the last National Democratic platform, for 'revenue only,' submitting of course to such accidental protection as may be incident thereto as an evil to be endured rather than an end to be attained. On the contrary, the Republican Party believes in a protective tariff; that in imposing duties upon imports revenue is not the only consideration, but that these duties should be so adjusted as to give encouragement to American enterprise, investment to American capital, and employment to American labor; and the Republican Party insists that our present protective system shall not be disturbed except so far as it may be necessary to correct its incongruities and harmonize its provisions.

"With these two conflicting theories it is easy to understand why the contest arises, at the very threshold, upon the method of reduction. If we reduce our revenues by removing or materially lessening internal taxes, our protective system cannot be seriously disturbed; on the contrary, if we follow the lead of the President and secure a reduction by such a revision of the tariff as he proposes, leaving untouched our internal revenues, not only will our protective system be destroyed, but the Nation itself will be well out on

the highway to Free Trade. Therefore it is that the Free-Trader would take as little as possible from internal taxation that he may more successfully assail our protective policy; while the Protectionist would take as much as possible from internal revenues that he may more surely defend it. At the foundation, therefore, of this controversy lies the question of policy, which must be first settled before we can come to an intelligent consideration of the Committee's Bill; and as we are Free-Traders or Protectionists that Bill will be approved or condemned.

"I propose, therefore, at this time to submit some general observations touching our revenue system, leaving the discussion of the details of the proposed measure to an occasion when their consideration will be immediately in hand. I may pause a moment, however, in passing, to say of this measure as a whole that in its inception and presentation to this House it stands without a parallel in the history of American legislation. Conceived in darkness, brought forth in secrecy,—its parentage carefully concealed,—it was at last laid at the door of the Committee on Ways and Means, where the majority took it up as tenderly as though it were their legitimate offspring, and hurriedly brought the 'lump of deformity' into this House, to be adopted by the Democratic Party and nursed by the harlot of Free Trade. But whatever

its parentage, whether British Free-Trader or the Cobden Club,—either of whom is capable of the outrage,—justice compels me to state that public suspicion does not attach to any member of the minority; and in further vindication of their high character it will be no violation of the secrets of the committee-room to state that, when pressed upon this point, there was no member of the majority so lost to all sense of personal pride as to admit the parentage.

“But seriously. Think of the majority of a great committee of this House, charged with the duty of considering an important message of the President of the United States, hiding away from the minority of that committee for six weeks and in some secret place, taking counsel possibly of the enemies of our industries, without consultation with the minority, framing a measure involving the industrial prosperity of 60,000,000 people; and, when completed and presented to the full committee, that same majority refusing to enter upon consideration of its provisions or to disclose any data upon which their action was based; stolidly refusing to answer any and every question propounded by the minority touching any portion of the Bill; submitting to no modification in a single particular, unless suggested by the majority; declining to listen to any member of this House in behalf of the people he represents; refusing audience to Sena-

tors, the industries of whose States were to be crippled or destroyed; rejecting all appeals from manufacturers whose connection with their industries enabled them to point out the pernicious effects of the proposed measure; refusing to hear one word of protest from the farmer whose flocks and fields are to be despoiled; shutting the door of the committee-room in the face of the laboring men of the country who came to plead for the protection of their homes and their families. Imagine, I say, such conduct on the part of a committee of this House, and you have a faint conception of the Committee on Ways and Means of the Fiftieth Congress.

“But to resume the course of my argument. We have today a double system of taxation, direct and indirect. Heretofore it has never been the settled policy of the Government permanently to maintain both. A choice of methods was open to the founders of the Republic, and they wisely determined to raise the needed revenue for the support of the Government by imposing a duty on imports. That method has never been suspended. It has undergone modifications, at different times, to conform to Party demands, but it has never for an hour been wholly abandoned. It is the approved and established method of providing for the ordinary expenses of the Government. True, direct taxation has sometimes been

resorted to to meet unforeseen National emergencies, but heretofore it has always been abandoned as soon as the exigency has passed. Previous to the War of the Rebellion direct taxation was invoked only in two instances,—first in 1791, to meet the extraordinary demands of a new Government with an empty treasury and an unestablished credit, and again in 1813, to provide the sinews of war in the second conflict with Great Britain. In both instances, however, direct taxation was abandoned at the earliest moment consistent with National honor and safety. The law of 1791 remained in force but nine years, and was repealed at the earnest solicitation of President Jefferson, while the Act of 1813, after having been on the statute books but four years, was expunged upon the recommendation of President Monroe. . . .

“Assuming that the American people will not abandon a policy adopted by the fathers and approved by a century of experience, I come to the consideration of the vital point at issue, namely, upon what articles shall duties be imposed, and to what extent shall they be levied,—with regard to revenue only or for the double purpose of revenue and protection? Shall the theories of the Free-Trader prevail and dominate in the revision of our tariff, or shall it continue to be adjusted not only with a view to revenue but for the promotion of American interests? This

is the question at issue. In this contest the Republican Party takes the side of Protection, and will resist to the uttermost any attempt coming from whatever source it may to cripple American industries, destroy American capital, or pauperize American labor. . . .

“But what is the revision proposed by this Bill? First, by putting on the free-list articles which last year yielded a revenue of \$22,000,000. Now, all Parties agree that anything and everything which is not and cannot be produced in this country, and cannot therefore come in competition with any domestic industry, shall be admitted free of duty. But the free-list in this Bill goes far beyond that, and exposes to foreign assault many of our most important industries, particularly those of agriculture. There is not a schedule of our tariff it does not invade. The great wool-growing interest of the country, a matter of prime necessity to a civilized people, only in the infancy of its development, capable of producing, if properly fostered and encouraged, the material for the clothing of all our people, is to be exposed to a ruinous foreign competition which will surely prove its ultimate destruction with all the capital invested therein. The majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, in their report on this Bill, seek to delude the people with the idea that free wool means cheaper

wool, and with it cheaper clothing, and that the farmers can well afford to submit to the destruction of sheep husbandry that they may thereby obtain cheaper woolen goods.

“That wool would be cheaper while our foreign rivals were engaged in destroying this domestic industry is quite possible; but when they have completed their work of demolition, when they have driven our flocks to the slaughter-pen and eliminated from our market an annual production of 300,000,000 pounds of domestic wool, we will find ourselves bound hand and foot, manufacturers and consumers alike, at the mercy of the foreign producer. What restraint then will there be upon his power or cupidity?

“What I have said touching this industry will apply with equal force to the main body of the free-list. But I must pass on to the third method proposed, namely, the reduction of rates on the dutiable list, and here we enter the field of speculation. Now, I do not hesitate to affirm that, taking this measure as a whole, no man living, even if a member of the secret cabal that framed it, is audacious enough to predict with any degree of certainty the amount of reduction it will secure. . . .

“But I have alluded to this in this connection not so much for the purpose of showing the impracticability of the proposed method, as to call attention to the

fact that the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means proposed to take only \$24,000,000 from internal taxation, while a reduction of \$54,000,000 is attempted to be secured by the lowering or total abolition of duties on imports in the interest of foreign rival industries, and to the detriment and destruction of our own. This fact alone is sufficient to confirm public apprehension and belief that the Democratic Party, or at least the controlling wing of it, while professing an anxiety to relieve the people of unnecessary taxation, is much more anxious to destroy our protective system than to stop the accumulation of a needless surplus. With an easy and open way to a sure and ample reduction of the revenues without disturbing a single American industry or paralyzing a single arm of labor, yet the Democratic Party declines to walk therein, preferring that other course, strewn with the wrecks of a Nation's experience, and fraught with the utmost peril to all our interests and all our people. . . .

“The President seeks to allay public apprehension in this regard by declaring that in the execution of this plan care will be taken not to cripple or destroy our manufactures or work ‘loss of employment to the working-man or the lessening of his wages.’ As if his plan could be carried out without working such a result! As well might the surgeon, having an-

nounced his intention to remove the heart of his patient, seek to allay his fears by the assurance that he would not disturb his circulation or impair his physical energies! One is as preposterous as the other. But the President, and I suppose the authors and advocates of this measure, will endeavor to induce the American people to submit to this suicidal operation by administering some sort of narcotic, which for the moment will dethrone their judgment and make them oblivious to the dangers of the experiment. And here let me say there is nothing so conducive to this state of insensibility as the seductive influence of that theory that a duty on imports is a tax on the consumer. Once induce the people to believe that they are unjustly taxed and there is no political quackery they will not endure which gives promise of relief. Conscious of this fact, the President in his annual message reasserts in the most positive manner that theory, which I had supposed was long since exploded, that a duty imposed upon an imported article by so much enhances the price of such article to the consumer, and that therefore the removal of such duty would proportionately reduce the price. . . .

“But what answer is to be made to this theory? There is one at least comprehensive and complete. It is not true. I commend to the President his ad-

monition to others, to remember 'it is a condition which confronts us, not a theory'; and that condition is an absolute refutation of his theory. . . . I challenge any man to name the product of a single well-established American industry that cannot be bought cheaper today under our protective system than during any period of our history under Free Trade or a tariff for revenue only. . . .

"It is an astounding fact that the value of the 200,000,000 acres of farm lands in the eleven States composing the late Confederacy are not equal to the 26,000,000 acres of farm lands in the States of New York and New Jersey. I beg to assure the gentlemen of the South that I have drawn this contrast in no invidious spirit, but only in confirmation of the fact that the development of manufactures tends to enhance the value of agricultural lands. It seems to me, however, that there is a lesson to be drawn from this of inestimable value to you. The South needs this development. Protection has brought it to the North,—it will bring it to you. You have but to accept it and it will bring to you an era of unexampled prosperity. It will open and develop your mines, explore your forests, light the fires of your furnaces, build your factories, construct your railways, invite capital to investment, give employment to your labor, plant cities in your waste places, and lead your people

into the highway of industrial progress. You have already entered thereon. During the last ninety days \$36,000,000 of capital have gone into your manufacturing industries. In this I rejoice. There is not an industry in the South, the development of which would redound to her glory, that I would not as jealously guard as though it were the industry of Michigan. I believe in Protection not for my State alone but for my country. I believe in American industries, American capital, American labor, against the whole world. . . .

“Let me warn you, gentlemen of the South, that this measure bodes no good to you. It will arrest the investment of capital in your midst and bring your industries to a stand-still. There is no portion of our country where this measure should meet with a more united and determined opposition than in the South. Untoward circumstances have heretofore retarded her material progress, but the way is now open for her to march unimpeded to a splendid industrial future. The advance is already sounded. He who does not respond to its inspiring summons will soon find himself without a Party and without a following. I rejoice that there is a new South, a new industrial South, born of the throes of war, but full of hope and full of courage. She stands today with uplifted brow facing the dawn of a mighty future. Her loins

are girt for a new race. With unfettered hands she smites the earth, and fountains of unmeasured wealth gush forth. Beneath her feet she feels the stir of a marvelous life. Her pathway is already illumined with the light of blazing furnaces. Her heavens are aglow with the break of a new day. All hail its on-coming! . . . And when the sun shall reach the zenith of that glorious day, the North and the South, cemented in the indissoluble bonds of commercial and fraternal unity, will stand together under the banner of protection to American industries and American labor, and march to grander industrial triumphs."

After reading the foregoing extracts from Burrows' speech against the Mills Bill in the House it is of interest to turn to his use of the same material in campaign work, and to note how the finished, forensic style changes to suit the audience he sees before him. This extract is from an address delivered during the Harrison campaign:

"They only changed that Bill seventy-five times after they got it into the House, by actual count. When they got it in there somebody said, 'Why, Mr. Mills, you must not put marble on the free list. There is Tennessee, a great marble producing country, and I will lose my district.' So they put it back. They started out to make this Bill a tariff for revenue only, and they ended by making it a tariff for Con-

gressmen only. They put wood screws on the free list, and all Connecticut was in a turmoil. Why, that would make it go Republican! and they put wood screws back. Why such philosophic problems! That is the way to solve the great economical questions, to find out who can be elected to Congress. And here was Lawler. He said, 'Why, Mr. Mills, you put glue on the free list.' And Mr. Mills says, 'Isn't that raw material? Don't we want glue in the manufacture of furniture, and don't we want glue free?' And Lawler says, 'Maybe that is so; but my stars! glue is a great industry in my district; glue is the only thing that holds me to my seat!' Well, glue went right back. And so they go around, fooling about, to see whom they elect to Congress, fixing a Bill simply to secure the next House of Representatives."

CHAPTER IX

THE MCKINLEY BILL. 1890

THE McKinley Bill, while outrageously misunderstood and misrepresented for campaign purposes during the first six months of its existence, proved to be the most thorough and consistent revision of the tariff from a protective point of view that had ever been made. In brief, the new Act admitted free whatever did not compete with home products, and placed heavy duties upon whatever did compete, exactly carrying out the principles advocated by Burrows in the speeches already quoted. In addition to this, the Bill included an entirely new phase by adding, at Blaine's insistence, the principle of Reciprocity, which gave the President power to lay duties upon certain of the free goods in case their country of origin seemed to tax our exports unduly. In contrast to the "star chamber" proceedings which surrounded the framing of the Mills Bill, the Committee on Ways and Means offered to every interest the fullest opportunity to present facts, and every effort was made to construct a Bill which should be consistent and best serve the greatest number of conflicting interests.

Burrows was once described by Henry Loomis Nelson as one who "could deftly defend his leader after he had mastered his brief." As far as the McKinley Bill was concerned, his speech in its defense could come only from one who was defending a brief which he himself had been largely instrumental in creating.¹ The speech itself is considered by many to be the best presentation of Tariff philosophy ever given before Congress; the following description of its reception by one who was present at the time evidences the effect produced by its delivery:

"The writer remembers with what pleasure and delight he listened to Mr. Burrows' speech upon the McKinley Bill when it was before the House. It had been announced that he would speak, and the galleries were crowded. It seemed as though every member of the House was in his seat, and many Senators honored the speaker with their presence. The door-ways and aisles were crowded with clerks and *attachés* of the House. Every newspaper reporter in Washington was present, busily writing and sending reports to the metropolitan press. Even the diplomatic gallery was filled with foreign ministers and their families, who listened with unfeigned pleasure to the eloquence of one of America's greatest orators. Every available space in the vast hall was crowded to

¹ See McKinley's acknowledgment, *ante*, page 235.

suffocation, and yet the immense crowd was as quiet as a church. Mr. Burrows was in his best and happiest mood. His melodious voice penetrated each nook and corner without apparent effort. Every one in the vast assembly seemed entranced, and for nearly two hours he held them spellbound with his oratory. It was a treat of a lifetime, and was a proud moment for men of Michigan who felt the spell of the occasion, and could say that they were from the State which claimed Burrows for a favorite son. As the crowd filed out and dispersed, one distinguished Senator was heard to remark to another: 'Burrows has this day fired a shot that will be heard around the world.' He said only what all thought but none so well expressed."

The following extracts from this speech not only give the reader the clearest possible idea of Tariff legislation, but exhibit the consummate mastery of the subject which its author possessed:

"If there is any article on the free-list in this Bill the like of which, by fair and adequate protection, could be produced in this country in sufficient quantities to meet the home demand, it is an oversight on the part of the majority of the Committee, and, if it can be pointed out, we will move that it be transferred to the dutiable list and given such protection as will insure its production in this country.

“If there is a single article on the dutiable list where the duty is so low as to expose the like domestic industry to a ruinous foreign competition and thus endangers its permanency, it has but to be indicated to secure such measure of protection as will insure its safety.

“If the proposed rate of duty on any article on the dutiable list is in excess of what is required to give fair and adequate protection to the competing domestic industry, none will be more ready than the majority of your Committee to reduce the rate to the level of such requirement.

“Upon this theory the Bill is constructed, and we present it to the House and the country not with the assurance that it is perfect in all its details, but with confidence that its general framework is in harmony with the spirit and policy of the Republican Party. It is intended to be a measure of Protection from its enacting clause to its closing paragraph. If there is a single provision in it which in its practical working will inure to the benefit of any foreign industry to the detriment of our own, I say frankly that such provision is there by inadvertence, and not by intention. If there is a section in this Bill which will bring disaster to any American industry or paralyze the arm of a single laboring-man in the United States, such section is there by accident, and not by design.

“The entire Bill is framed expressly with a view of admitting free of duty all articles the like of which are not and cannot be produced in this country, and imposing duties on the articles we do produce, with the double purpose of securing sufficient revenue for the support of the Government, while, at the same time, fostering and diversifying American industries, giving investment to American capital, and employment to American labor.

“But nothing can more forcibly illustrate the two theories thus outlined than a comparison of some of the provisions of the measure we propose with those of the Mills Bill, so called, which is the accepted embodiment of the doctrine of the Democratic Party on the Tariff question.

“The two measures fully illustrate the two conflicting, irreconcilable theories. I will take as an illustration the article of tin-plate. The present duty is one cent a pound. The Mills Bill proposed to remove that duty and place tin-plate on the free-list. We propose, on the contrary, not only not to make it free, but to increase the duty to at least two cents a pound, with a view of establishing the industry in the United States.

“It is conceded that we are not producing a pound of tin-plate in the United States, and the Democratic Party would so legislate as to make its production

here an impossibility for all time to come, and thus not only continue our dependence on a foreign country for a supply of this article of prime necessity, but make our thralldom complete and perpetual. We propose, on the contrary, by a guaranty of ample protection, to invite American capital to enter a new field of investment and lay the foundations for the production of our own tin-plate; and instead of importing this product we would import and establish the industry itself, and so not only furnish increased employment for American labor, keep the millions at home now annually spent abroad, but ultimately reduce the price to the American consumer of every pound of tin-plate entering into our consumption, both foreign and domestic.”¹

“But the opponents of this measure criticise us not only for protecting the articles they would admit free of duty, but because we do not propose a general reduction of duties all along the line to what they

¹ As a matter of record, and as evidence of the far-sighted importance of establishing the new industry of making tin-plate, we have but to quote from Burrows' speech against the Wilson Bill made four years later: “Nowhere in the field of our industrial achievements was the triumph of our protective system more completely vindicated than in the creation of the American tin-plate industry. It is as astounding as it is gratifying. On the first day of July, 1891, there was practically no manufacture of tin-plate in the United States. . . . For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, an aggregate manufacture of tin and terne plates in the United States of 108,621,883 pounds. Yet in the report of the Committee this great and growing industry is characterized as a ‘bogus industry’!”

may be pleased to regard a revenue basis. They seem to be laboring under the delusion that in order to reduce the revenues it is only necessary to lower the rate of duty on imports. Nothing could be more fallacious. It is a most delicate matter so to adjust the duty on imports as to secure equitable results to all. Some one has said that 'our tariff system is like a spider's web; touch a single thread of it and the whole fabric trembles.' Our industries are so interwoven and interdependent that a modification of the rates in a single particular would be felt throughout the entire system. It is a difficult matter so to adjust duties as to secure revenue and at the same time adequately protect the domestic industry. If the duty is too high, it is prohibition, with no revenue to the Government and danger of monopoly at home. If the duty is too low, importations will flow in in such abundance as not only to increase the revenue but to endanger and ultimately destroy the domestic industry. . . .

"That we have increased rates in some instances is true. Whenever we have found an established American industry suffering from foreign competition to such an extent as to endanger its permanency and threaten its destruction, we have not hesitated to give it such additional protection as will insure its maintenance and prosperity. In this connection I

am frank to say that in making these increases we have not been actuated so much by a desire to avoid large percentages as by that higher consideration, the necessities of American industries and American labor. When, therefore, we have found a domestic manufacturer being driven from his own market by a remorseless foreign competition, we have not hesitated to interpose just such Governmental protection as will insure to the American producer an equal chance, at least, in his own market. . . .

“But suppose the duty does in some instances increase the price of the article to the consumer, shall we therefore abandon the policy of Protection, throw down every barrier, and invite foreign manufacturers to take possession of our market because, forsooth, it will bring to our people cheaper products? Is it a mere question of cheapness? Cheap clothing, cheap wages, cheap food, cheap houses, cheap men. Are there no higher considerations? Into this race for cheapness the Republican Party does not propose to enter. . . .

“It has been said and will be repeated that the protective system tends to produce unnatural conditions, overproduction, and consequent trusts and combines, to the destruction of healthy competition and the detriment of the people. Suppose that to be true, is that any reason why the system itself should be aban-

doned? There are numerous evils growing out of a free government, but is that any reason why such a government should be demolished and a despotism erected on its ruins? Statesmanship dictates, rather, correction of these evils while maintaining the government. We have already passed a measure¹ aimed at these trusts and combines which, it is hoped, will uproot and destroy the last vestige of their tyrannical power.

“I have no apology to offer for the men who seek to deprive the people of the benefit of fair prices which unrestrained domestic competition insures. When an industry in the United States has been built up under the fostering care of the Government, and then the beneficiaries thereof, feeling the effect of domestic competition, combine to prevent the resultant benefits to the people, I would say to all such, if you will not permit free and unrestrained competition at home, you shall encounter the competition of the world. It would be well, however, to remember in this connection that trusts are not confined to protected countries or to protected industries. . . .

“We have sought in this measure to reduce the surplus revenues to the basis of Governmental needs without impairing a single American industry or depriving a single laboring man of the products of his

¹ The Sherman Anti-Trust Act, enacted July 2, 1890.

toil. We submit this measure to the considerate judgment of the House and the country in the confident belief that, if enacted into law, it will impart a fresh stimulus to all our industries, relieve whatever of depression there may now exist, and bring to all the people a new era of increased prosperity."

The McKinley Bill was passed and became effective on October 6, 1890, only a month before the Congressional elections. The Democrats saw their opportunity to score a point with the public by misrepresenting the features of the new Act, and so successful were they in their work, and so complete was the confusion in the popular mind, that a revulsion passed over the country, sweeping a Democratic majority into both House and Senate. Two years later Cleveland was returned to the White House.

Looking backwards, it seems preposterous that the tactics adopted by the Democrats should have been so successful and so far-reaching. The reader will probably remember having seen posted prominently in the store windows, during the second Harrison-Cleveland campaign, parallel lines of figures showing the prices of selected articles before and after the McKinley Tariff went into effect, but neither the reader nor the other thousands who also saw these placards realized that these exhibits were carefully prepared for a definite purpose; that the prices on

certain articles were deliberately raised to a fictitious point in order to produce an effect, later to be reduced when this effect has been accomplished; that some of the articles named on these lists were not even indirectly affected by the McKinley Bill; that hundreds of pedlers were sent throughout the rural districts offering for sale, but with no expectation of selling them, five-cent tin cups priced at twenty-five cents; twenty-five cent tin pails priced at \$1.00, explaining to the horrified farmers' wives that these prices were necessitated by the Tariff Bill foisted upon the country by the unscrupulous Republican Party! In one of his later campaign speeches Burrows remarks on this point:

“In the history of all political Parties in this country there was never such a persistent misrepresentation as was made during those thirty days. I spoke with a gentleman from Massachusetts recently who told me that a Free-Trader hired a man with a wagon of fish, and bought him a horn, and told him to take that wagon-load of fish and carry them through the country until they spoiled. He did not care whether he sold any or not, so he asked twenty cents a pound for them. He was to go to every farmer in the country and ask him if he did not want some fish. When the old farmer's wife came out, anxious for the fish for dinner, she was told that fish had gone up to

twenty cents a pound, all because of the McKinley Bill; and the old lady returned to the house and blew the horn, and, as her husband came up, she made him swear that he would vote against the McKinley Bill on account of those fish."

When the McKinley Bill was completed in committee McKinley claimed for the majority that it would reduce the customs duties about sixty-one million dollars, while Roger Q. Mills for the minority members claimed that it would increase the duties about four million dollars. If there was this difference of opinion in the minds of the majority and minority members of the same Committee, working with the same data before them, it is perhaps not to be wondered at that the people themselves should be so completely befuddled. As a matter of fact, the decrease shown by the first year of operation was about fifty-two million dollars, which, in itself, is a verdict in favor of the intelligent foresight on the part of the majority members.

McKinley himself, defeated for reelection to Congress by the landslide caused by the Bill, said: "Increased prosperity which is sure to come will outrun the maligner and villifier. Reason will be enthroned, and none will suffer so much as those who have participated in misguiding a trusting people." ¹

¹ *Olcott*: "The Life of William McKinley," volume I, page 188.

When a nail is driven into a post the hole remains even after the nail is withdrawn. The fact that the McKinley Tariff was proving successful could not be grasped by the voters, even though fully appreciated by economists and students of the subject. With the return of the Democratic Party to power, business, from perfectly natural economic causes, suffered a serious depression, which the Democrats used as further evidence of the disastrous effects of the McKinley Bill. Burrows' retort to this accusation, made in the course of his remarks upon the Wilson Bill which is to be considered later, is characteristically apt:

"This general paralysis of business throughout the country," he said, "comes solely from the ascendancy of a political Party pledged to the repeal of the Act of 1890, and the substitution therefor of a tariff divested of all protective features. With such a Party in full control of the Government is it any wonder that domestic manufacturers suspend operations until advised of the conditions under which they must market their output? Business prudence dictated the suspension of the manufacture of domestic fabrics with high-priced labor until the conditions should be determined upon which the foreign competing products should be permitted to enter our markets. Importers naturally limited their orders to the strict necessities of trade in anticipation of more

favorable conditions. And so manufacturer and importer alike prudently suspended business until the Democratic Party should fix the terms upon which they would be permitted to resume. When the judge pronounces the sentence of death on the convicted felon there is no change in the law, but the victim is apt to lose interest in human affairs. On an ocean voyage the chart and compass may remain undisturbed, but with a madman at the wheel and a lunatic on the bridge the interest of the passengers will be chiefly centered in the supply of life preservers."

In a letter dated October 1, 1893, ex-President Harrison wrote to Burrows, giving his viewpoint on the situation at a time when he could look back upon it freed from personal concern:

From ex-President Harrison

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

MY DEAR BURROWS:

You know from conversations I have had with you that my purpose was in that last message to put a mark on the stone by which the receding of our prosperity, which was inevitable, might be seen and measured. I can understand how a man may hold to the views of the Free-Trader or Tariff Reformer and yet be mentally sound and morally sincere; but I cannot understand how any man not a subject for guardian-

ship can think that a country can pass from the McKinley Bill to the Chicago platform without disastrous convulsions, or that when the rough passage has been made it will not leave the laboring men with a lower scale of wages. My own impression of these people is that the intelligent among them did see these results, and not a few of them contemplated them with favor. I tried to point out in my letter of acceptance that so far as the election was a choice between men it was of minor importance, but that the choice between policies involved stupendous results. The conservative Democrats, business men, bankers, etc., of the East did not see the distinction. They saw in Mr. Cleveland a conservative man, and forgot to take account of a Democratic Congress. Their mistake, I think, must be apparent to them now.

But I did not intend to lead into a discussion of public affairs; however, of course I continue to feel a strong but quiet interest in everything. I am spending my days in my library preparing my lectures for Stanford University, and giving needed attention to a few important legal matters that I have become connected with.

With the very kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely your friend,

BENJAMIN HARRISON

CHAPTER X

RECIPROCITY. 1889-1902

WHEN the principle of Reciprocity was written into the McKinley Bill a new phase of Republican legislation began, and over this the struggle was long and exciting. James G. Blaine of Maine may properly be called the Father of Reciprocity. While Secretary of State in the Garfield Administration he proposed a Pan-American Congress, but the idea did not take concrete form until the last year of Cleveland's Administration. When the Congress finally convened, Blaine by a curious coincidence was again Secretary of State, this time in the Harrison Cabinet, and was ready to give to it a hearty welcome. Representatives of nineteen independent nations of the Western Hemisphere met in Washington in October, 1889, to consider such points as the method of communication between South and North American ports; the establishment of a uniform system of weights and measures; the possible adoption of a common silver coin; and a plan to arbitrate disputed questions which might at any time arise between the nations represented at the conference. Blaine him-

self was strongly in favor of the principle of extending trade through reciprocal arrangements, and he might perhaps have persuaded the Lower House to incorporate this principle into the McKinley Bill except for the fact that South America was so strongly an agricultural country that high Protectionists feared freedom of trade might make it a dangerous competitor of the North American Western farmer. The idea of Reciprocity was furthermore viewed with suspicion, fearing lest commercial freedom should finally result in admitting free of duty, or at low rates, the wools, hides, lead and copper ores of Central and South America.

Undismayed by the hostile attitude shown towards his pet project on the part of the Lower House, Blaine carried the fight on to the Senate. His plan was that the United States should retain certain duties until the exporting countries made adequate concessions. He would use sugar to open Cuban and other Southern markets for the provisions and bread-stuffs produced by American farmers. To place a duty on hides, Blaine contended, was "a slap in the face to the South Americans. . . . Such movements as these for Protection will protect the Republican Party into a speedy retirement." Senator Aldrich came to Blaine's aid, and by slightly modifying his proposition succeeded in forcing the measure into the Mc-

Kinley Bill. This modification authorized the President to impose discriminating duties in case Reciprocity was withheld, instead of permitting him to reduce duties if reciprocal privileges were granted.

Burrows was heartily in sympathy with Blaine's idea of Reciprocity, and soon appeared as his spokesman throughout the country. In 1892 the following editorial appeared in the *Detroit Tribune*:

"A special despatch from Washington to the *New York Press* says: 'Representative Julius Cæsar Burrows has received a document which he will put behind glass and hang in a gold frame. It is nothing less than a letter from James G. Blaine, informing Mr. Burrows that he is looked upon as the brightest star in the galaxy of Reciprocity advocates, and requesting him to be the exponent of Mr. Blaine at the coming Reciprocity Banquet in Boston. Every line of the letter is full of compliment for the Michigan Representative, so that he is naturally proud of it, and looks upon it as one of the greatest prizes of his political life.'

"Mr. Burrows may well be proud of his commission from the great author of the Reciprocity policy to appear in his place at tonight's banquet in honor of the successful issue of that policy. It is superfluous to add that the compliment to Michigan's ablest Congressman is well deserved and excellently placed.

Mr. Blaine could not have selected a better representative, nor one more fully alive to the merits of his scheme of trade expansion. At Mr. Burrows' hands the topic of Reciprocity will receive thorough and appreciative consideration. In the presentation of this subject Mr. Burrows will have the immense tactical advantage not only of appearing in behalf of Mr. Blaine, but of appearing as the exponent of a policy of unqualified success and unquestioned utility. No administrative policy of recent date has better justified itself or more rapidly won popular favor than Mr. Blaine's scheme of trade extension through reciprocal treaties. Something over a year and a half has elapsed since Mr. Blaine forced upon the attention of the Ways and Means Committee of the House the Reciprocity idea, which was some months later incorporated into the McKinley Tariff Law. Less than a year has gone by since the conclusion of the first Reciprocity Treaty, that with Brazil, which is dated February 5, 1891. Following the completion of the Brazilian convention, came in quick succession the announcement of treaties with Spain, Germany, San Domingo, the British West Indies, Guatemala, Costa Rica, and Salvador. Negotiations are now pending with Columbia and Mexico, and Nicaragua and Venezuela will probably not long remain outside the American *zollverein*.

"So much with respect to the carrying into effect of the policy which has given the lie to every prediction of its enemies. But, they say, the true test of its success should be its efficacy in the promotion of trade. This is admitted; but many of the treaties have not yet been long enough in force to permit of the readjustment of trade relations or to allow our merchants to take advantage of the concessions secured. In Brazilian and Cuban trade, however, a notably beneficial influence has been felt, demonstrable statistically by trade reports. One more year will tell an irrefutable story of trade expansion, the conclusive test of the commercial value of Reciprocity. As to its popularity, that is a matter of common observation. There are no objectors save the envious, and no critics except those who would extend Reciprocity to Free Trade.

"Mr. Burrows will thus have a magnificent record to present this evening. He will tell of a substantial achievement in the domain of statesmanship; he will describe a tangible something that has been done for the American people. The distinction of the achievement and the doing is Mr. Blaine's, and it constitutes his chiefest claim upon the gratitude of his fellow-citizens."

The Annual Banquet of the Boston Merchants Association, to which the foregoing editorial refers, was

held at Hotel Vendome in Boston, January 7, 1892, and the speech made by Burrows on that occasion became famous the country over because of his *bon mot*, "Protection is defense—Reciprocity is conquest." In the course of his remarks he said:

"Among the powers conferred upon the National Government, under the Constitution of the United States, none is more important and comprehensive than that which authorizes Congress 'to regulate commerce with foreign nations.' It was the want of this power under the Confederation, more than anything else, which led to the early abandonment of that form of government and the substitution of the Federal Constitution. It was Webster, I think, who said: 'We may invoke all the debates in all the State conventions, and the expressions of all the greatest men in the country, and we shall find it everywhere held up as the main reason for the adoption of the Constitution that it would give to the general Government power to regulate commerce and trade.'

"Some conception may be had of the magnitude of the interests thus committed to the exclusive care and regulation of the National Government, when the fact is recalled that the value of the foreign commerce of the United States during the last fiscal year reached the unexampled and stupendous sum of \$1,729,397,000. To regulate by just and wholesome laws this

vast and ever-swelling volume of foreign trade, extending to every commercial nation on the globe, is a task commanding the highest statesmanship and the most accomplished diplomacy.

“The character and scope of the regulations which the National Government is permitted to impose are nowhere specifically defined and set forth in the Constitution, unless it be in that provision which authorizes Congress to ‘lay and collect duties’ on imports. Under this power the whole volume of our import trade may be substantially regulated and controlled. It was by invoking this power under the Constitution that the first regulation of our foreign commerce was secured under National authority.

“The first Act of the First Congress relating to and affecting our foreign trade was passed on the 4th day July, 1789, and consisted in imposing a specific charge on certain designated imports, the payment of which was a necessary prerequisite to the admission of such imports into the United States. This was a regulation of commerce with foreign nations. . . . The declared purpose of this Act was threefold. *First*, ‘for the support of the Government’; *secondly*, ‘for the discharge of the debts of the United States,’ and *thirdly*, ‘for the encouragement and protection of manufactures.’

“It must be conceded that whenever duties are im-

posed on imports for either or all of the purposes named it is a regulation of commerce more or less effective according to the purposes for which these exactions are imposed, and I may say that these regulations are never more potent, sweeping, and comprehensive than when made for the encouragement and protection of manufactures.

“This method of regulating trade with foreign nations by the imposition of duties on imports has been pursued from the beginning of the Government under all Parties and all Administrations, and will be continued as a National policy so long as the Republic endures. True, rates may be changed, the free list enlarged or contracted, as the public exigency may require or Party expediency demand; yet this method of regulating foreign commerce will never be wholly abandoned.

“It will be observed that this method of regulating commerce applies directly only to our incoming trade, and in no degree, unless by indirection, does it affect our outgoing commerce. The Tariff Act of 1890 invoked another method of regulating commerce with foreign nations, looking not exclusively to our import trade, but to our vast and increasing outgoing commerce. It is an easy matter to regulate and control the incoming commerce, but it is quite another thing so to legislate as to open foreign markets for the sur-

plus products of our farms and factories. The productive power of this country is the marvel of nations. By the census of 1880 it was disclosed that the value of our output in a single year from agriculture, manufactures, mines, forests, and fisheries aggregated the fabulous sum of \$20,000,000,000. What it is to-day as disclosed by the census of 1890 I am not able to state, but that it is greatly augmented cannot be questioned.

“Great as is the capacity of our domestic market, which should ever be regarded of the first importance in our National economy, yet, when we have supplied ourselves, we have still a surplus which must find sale in the markets of foreign countries. To reach these markets with such surplus, with the advantages in our favor as against competing nations, is the great problem of modern statesmanship. The Tariff Act of 1890 seeks to accomplish this great end, and the hour is ripe for its consummation. The great republics south of us, with their 50,000,000 of people, have met us in friendly council, and I am sure there has been cemented between us and them a bond of enduring friendship which will inure to the commercial advantages of all alike. If we avail ourselves of the opportunity now afforded, the statistician of the future will never again record the humiliating fact that . . . we purchased of these countries \$2.19

worth for every dollar they took from us. Reciprocity seeks to cure this inequality of trade. . . .

“This regulation of commerce has had an auspicious beginning. Already reciprocal treaties have been consummated with five nations and nine colonies, while at this hour we are negotiating agreements of reciprocity with six other nations. I have heard it urged in some quarters, with more vehemence than knowledge, that this doctrine of Reciprocity, as declared and applied, was an abandonment of the policy of Protection, and an acceptance of the tenets of Free Trade. Nothing could be more preposterous. There is not the remotest suggestion of Free Trade in it. It is fair trade, not Free Trade. We admit free of duty into the American market the things we do not, or cannot produce . . . and, in return therefor, secure reciprocal advantages in the markets of the countries supplying these articles. Reciprocity strikes down no American industry, cripples no American enterprise.

“Reciprocity antagonistic to Protection! Protection guards the home market; Reciprocity reaches out to the foreign markets. Protection establishes, builds up, and maintains American industries; Reciprocity opens a new outlet for the surplus products of our farms and factories. Protection gives employment to American labor; Reciprocity enlarges the

demand for the fruits of that labor, thereby insuring uninterrupted and enlarged employment. In a word, Protection is defense—Reciprocity is conquest.

“There is, therefore, no abandonment of the doctrine of Protection, but rather an increased demand for its maintenance. Under the policy of Protection and Reciprocity, coupled with that other policy, now happily inaugurated, of building up our merchant marine, and establishing swift and certain mail communications with the South American republics, there will be open to us a new market for the surplus products of our farms and factories. We shall re-light the seas of the globe with the stars of our flag, and the American Republic will hold its place in the van of marching empire.”

Reciprocity received a temporary setback when the Democratic Party came into power in 1893, as it was abolished by the Fifty-third Congress. By this time, however, it had become a fundamental basis of the Republican faith,—as President Roosevelt later expressed it, “Reciprocity is the handmaiden of Protection.”

After reading the address before the Boston Merchants' Association, it is interesting to consider Burrows' exposition of Reciprocity as it appeared to him in 1902, ten years later. It is of particular interest to the biographer inasmuch as the antagonistic posi-

tion taken by Burrows upon Cuban Reciprocity immediately following this period has been assumed by many to show a lack of consistency. This is what Burrows said in 1902:

“The subject of Reciprocity is attracting widespread attention of late, so much so that we hear on every hand discussion of reciprocity with France, with Argentine, with Cuba, with the British West Indies, with Canada, and with various other parts of the world more or less intimately associated with us by ties of friendship or geographical proximity. This subject of Reciprocity is not a new one, and it would seem as though a question which had been discussed with such thoroughness and through as many years would have assumed a certain definite and fixed aspect which every one would recognize and accept. But even after these years of discussion the doctrine of Reciprocity at times takes on proportions quite beyond those given it by its most sturdy upholders. It may be well, therefore, to consider just what Reciprocity is and what it is not.

“The term itself is rather ambiguous, and in the abstract it is like those good and homely virtues of friendship, generosity, and comity, which need only to be mentioned in order to be accepted. Indeed, one of the ancient sages has placed Reciprocity as foremost among the virtues, so that in the abstract

Reciprocity is as much a principle of human action as is generosity. But in being generous it is desirable first to be just; and so with Reciprocity. When it comes to giving it concrete form as an economic principle of commerce and of international intercourse, then it becomes necessary to consider those well-defined limitations designed to give it just, beneficial, and practical effect.

“True Reciprocity has been a cardinal principle in our public affairs for many years. Those who have developed the American system of Protection have at the same time advocated Reciprocity, so that these two great American principles, Protection and Reciprocity, have gone hand in hand, each as a supplement to the other. It should be borne in mind, however, that there have long been distinct and positive limitations to the application of this principle of Reciprocity. For instance, Reciprocity does not mean unfair trade with foreign countries; it does not mean the opening of our vast markets to foreign goods for competition with our own goods on equal terms. On the contrary, genuine Reciprocity means only such concessions to foreign countries as will bring us an ample equivalent in trade concessions from such countries, coupled with the further and cardinal principle that the products admitted into this market from foreign countries must be such as do not compete

with any established industry in the United States, or will not, if admitted, endanger the stability and continuous prosperity of such industry.

“The essential idea of those whose names have been prominently identified with Reciprocity has been such an exchange of commodities as would not endanger our own industries. In President McKinley’s Reciprocity speech at Buffalo he was careful to make plain the proper limitation of true Reciprocity. Whatever allusions he made,—and there were at least three references to foreign trade,—he was most careful to guard his expressions so as to conform to what has been regarded, and what is, the established doctrine on Reciprocity.

“For instance, speaking of trade arrangements with foreign countries, he said: ‘By sensible trade arrangements, which will not interrupt our home production, we should extend the outlets for our increasing surplus.’ There it is perfectly apparent that admitting and recognizing the necessity for a market for our surplus products of the farm and of the factory, yet he would not secure that foreign market for this surplus by any process which would ‘interrupt our home production.’

“Again he said, ‘We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.’ There, again, the doc-

trine of Reciprocity was sharply and clearly guarded by the expression 'such products as we can use without harm to our own industries,' showing that he was keeping steadily in view the protection of our own labor and our own industries. Then, again, in that same speech, he said: 'If, perchance, some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue, or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?' While he thus recognized the fact, which we all recognize, that some tariffs are no longer needed for revenue and could therefore be dispensed with, yet it will be observed that he even guarded cases of that kind with the further expression that such tariffs were not to be surrendered as a basis for Reciprocity, even if not needed for revenue, if they served 'to protect and encourage our industries at home.'

"Such a declaration on the part of William McKinley was but a reaffirmation of what I know to have been his lifelong conviction upon the question of Reciprocity, and for him in the closing years of his public career to abandon the cardinal principle of his lifework is not conceivable.

"So, in a word, I may say that true and just Reciprocity is that which admits into this market things we do not and cannot produce, in exchange for an

equivalent in the market of the country thus favored by us. But under no circumstances can we admit into this country, either free of duty or at a low rate of duty, goods coming in competition with our home production and our home labor, which would have a tendency to jeopardize the prosperity of either the factory or labor. Reciprocal trade based upon admitting into this market things we do not produce is quite difficult of accomplishment, because of the important fact that forty-three per cent. of all our imports into the United States today come in free of duty. Forty-three per cent. of our tremendous imports free of duty! With this condition established, of course it is too late to make reciprocal arrangements with countries already favored by the free entry of their goods into our markets.

“The plea put forward as to the necessity of a foreign market is very much overestimated. It is a fact that the industrial output of the United States last year, embracing the farm, the factories, the mines, and the forest, aggregated \$21,500,000,000. Of that tremendous aggregate the United States consumed within its own borders \$20,000,000,000, leaving but \$1,500,000,000 seeking foreign markets. Certainly we should be very careful in whatever arrangements we make to protect first the home market, which is such an absorbent of home products,

and we shall make a frightful blunder to lessen one iota the capacity of the home market for the uncertain and temporary advantage of any foreign market.

“But if we turn to our foreign markets they seem to be in such vigorous health that we could well afford to let present conditions alone. Our exports during the eleven months ending last November reached the enormous total of \$1,302,760,535. Our imports during this same period aggregated \$800,426,231. So that, by the latest available statistics, the balance of trade is in our favor by \$548,463,157. This is a really remarkable showing, unequaled by any other country in the world, either as to exports or balance of trade. Why, then, should there be any anxiety about not getting our share of foreign markets? Our present commanding and controlling position in these markets indicates that our foreign trade is in a very vital and healthful condition.

“It is well to observe, in connection with the cry for more foreign markets, that we are today making inroads throughout Europe. This is particularly true as to England, because that country has Free Trade. Germany, France, and Austria raised tariff barriers which impeded our entry into their markets; nevertheless, we have made advances in spite of all their barriers. In fact, if all the markets of Europe

were open to us we would drive Europe out of her own markets, by reason of our wonderful advancement in machinery, in inventive genius, and our economy in production.

“Over and above all that comes the great advantages of our position in the Philippines and the Orient. Taking Manila as a center, the country tributary to it has a population of more than 800,000,000, with a trade commonly called the ‘trade of the Orient,’ of \$2,000,000,000. The Orient, so called, bought of foreign countries \$1,200,000,000 worth of goods, or \$100,000,000 a month, of which the United States unfortunately commanded only nine per cent., and yet the goods seeking this market were the very goods we produce in the United States, on the farm and in the factory, for the surplus of which we are anxious to secure a foreign market. It is this vast trade of the Orient, in my mind, that affords us the great outlet of the future, without Reciprocity for our growing surplus.

“When it comes to considering Reciprocity in the light of experience, it can hardly be said that it has proved an instrument for opening markets for our surplus products. Our treaty with Canada, which lasted about ten years, was really most disastrous. We sold less to Canada at the end of the period than we did at the beginning, while she flooded our mar-

kets. In 1854, the year before the reciprocity period began, we sold to Canada \$24,157,612. But in 1866, after ten years of Reciprocity, our sales to Canada were down to \$23,439,115. On the other hand, Canada benefited enormously. In 1854 she was sending us \$8,784,412. This soon doubled and quadrupled under Reciprocity, and was six-fold, viz., \$48,133,599, at the close of the reciprocity period. No wonder Canada desires by Reciprocity to cross the border and gain our vast markets in exchange for her small markets.

“This is a fair illustration of the effect of false Reciprocity. Surely it is not such Reciprocity which reduces our foreign markets and surrenders our home market to the foreigner that we are seeking. On the contrary, whatever is done in the line of true Reciprocity must be strictly within those well-defined limits which experience dictates, namely, that no American industry is to be imperiled in its stability or prosperity.”

At the time Burrows wrote the foregoing words McKinley was serving his second term as President. The disturbing problem of the Currency had settled down upon an apparently satisfactory basis, and National credit was reestablished. The country, as a whole, was prosperous, and the Nation had taken a new place before the world which made its position

upon all subjects stand out in greater prominence. McKinley was heartily in sympathy with the principles and the workings of the Reciprocity policy, as he attributed to this in certain measure the advance of the country politically as well as industrially. "He realized," states McKinley's biographer, "that the diversified production made possible by the rapid growth of the industries of the country had outstripped the capacity of the home market to absorb it, and that the foreign markets must be enlarged by broader commercial relations. Reciprocity arrangements had already been negotiated with France, Portugal, Italy, and Germany, and with Great Britain for her West Indian possessions; also with Nicaragua, Ecuador, and the Dominican Republic, and with Denmark in behalf of the Island of St. Croix. These conventions were then pending in the Senate, and it was the intention of the President to secure their ratification, if possible, and then to arrange new treaties with other nations. This policy, in his judgment, would preserve the principles of Protection at home and at the same time secure an outlet for the surplus products in foreign markets. He saw in the idea the supreme development of the theory to which he had given so many years of his life."¹

Burrows sympathized entirely with McKinley's

¹ *Olcott*: "Life of McKinley," volume II, page 298.

attitude, and, in fact, had done his part in bringing McKinley to this viewpoint. Burrows, because of his earlier association with the subject of Reciprocity at Blaine's behest, was perhaps more deeply steeped than any other man in the Republican ranks with the absolute belief that Reciprocity permitted the fullest and the ripest expression of Protection. And yet, Burrows is classified as an opponent of Reciprocity when applied to Cuba!

Burrows once made the statement, "Everybody is for Reciprocity provided it is at the expense of somebody else," and this remark came home to him many times during the struggle over Cuban Reciprocity. This, in brief, was an effort made by the Roosevelt Administration to apply the principles of Reciprocity to the little Island for whose independence we had so recently become sponsor. In accomplishing this, a diminution was proposed of the duty on sugar, which was to be offset by a reduction on the part of Cuba of duties on imports from the United States of all kinds, thus extending the market for our own manufactures and the profitable demand for our labor. All this would seem to be in the direction of the Reciprocity of Blaine and McKinley, and, in part, a consummation of Garfield's ideal, "the Protection that leads to Free Trade." And yet, Burrows not only arrayed himself against this treaty, but succeeded by allying

with himself twenty other Senators, in successfully blocking the passage of the Bill in spite of the tremendous pressure brought to bear by President Roosevelt and the entire Administrative forces. This caused an instant outcry, charging that Burrows was protecting the beet-sugar interests of Michigan. Some of the attacks were bitter, some were amusing. The following, for example, is taken from the *New York World*:

THE MILK IN THE COCOANUT
OR
THE SECRET OF SUPPORT FOR
RECIPROCITY LAID BARE

WASHINGTON, *November 21*

A drama in one short act

SCENE: *The White House*

TIME: *Friday, Nov. 21, 1902*

CHARACTERS

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

HENRY CABOT LODGE, *a Senator from Massachusetts*

JULIUS CÆSAR BURROWS, *a Senator from Michigan*

ARGUMENT: The PRESIDENT desires a Reciprocity Treaty admitting dried codfish from Newfoundland at reduced rates into the United States in

return for tariff concessions for articles made in this country, and a Reciprocity Treaty making a reduction on the duty on Cuban sugar in return for tariff concessions on American-made goods.

PLOT: Massachusetts produces dried codfish and Michigan produces beet sugar.

ACT I

(The President is discovered pacing up and down his private office in the White House. Senator Lodge sits on one side of the room and Senator Burrows on the other.)

The PRESIDENT. "Lodge, what do you think the chances are for Cuban Reciprocity this Winter?"

Senator LODGE. "Excellent, I should say, Mr. President. We want to assure you that we, of Massachusetts, will stand loyally by your Cuban Reciprocity policy in Congress this Winter. We approve it and we shall support it, but—

The PRESIDENT. "But what?"

Senator LODGE. "But we cannot approve, and shall not support your policy as regards dried codfish. There must be no reciprocity on codfish. We produce codfish. As for sugar, which we do not produce, we are with you."

The PRESIDENT (turning to Senator Burrows).

"Burrows, what do you think about it? Where does Michigan stand?"

Senator BURROWS. "Michigan is loyally with you, Mr. President, back to back, firm and united, in support of your codfish policy, but—"

The PRESIDENT. "But what?"

Senator BURROWS. "But we cannot approve, and must proceed with extreme caution as regards your policy of lowering the tariff on Cuban sugar. We produce sugar. We do not produce codfish. We stand for you on the codfish proposition."

The PRESIDENT. "Ah-h-h!"

CURTAIN

Here we see the personal application of Burrows' witticism. The contention that he was protecting the interests of his State was well founded. He was one of the few who were wise enough to discern that the Bill was really in the interest of the Sugar Trust, and that the result of the measure, if enacted, would be to cripple all independent concerns outside the Trust. The mass of the people believed the specious plea that Cuba would be benefited by the proposed reduction in the tariff, but Burrows refused to be diverted. He contended that in taking his stand he was protecting all those interests of all the States which the policy of Protection was intended to foster,

and was preventing the principle of Reciprocity from interfering with the bulwark of protection to American industries. If we turn back to the quotation already made from his speech in 1902 we find that he says, "Genuine Reciprocity means only such concessions to foreign countries as will bring us an ample equivalent in trade concessions from such countries, coupled with the further and cardinal principle that the products admitted into this market from foreign countries must be such as do not compete with any established industry in the United States, or will not, if admitted, endanger the stability and continuous prosperity of such industries." Again, he states, "True Reciprocity does not involve the destruction of American industries or the surrender of American markets for American products."¹

The struggle in the Senate became historical. After three months' work Burrows had allied with him against the Bill Senators Perkins and Bard, of California; Gamble and Kittredge, of South Dakota; Elkins and Scott, of West Virginia; Millard and Dietrich, of Nebraska; Nelson and Clapp, of Minnesota; Foster, of Washington; Mitchell and Simon, of Oregon; Burton, of Kansas; Kearns, of Utah; Pritchard, of North Carolina; Mason, of Illinois; Jones and Stewart, of Nevada; and Wellington, of Maryland.

¹ *Collier's Weekly*.

Elkins joined hands with him in leading the fight, but Elkins was opposed to Cuban Reciprocity because he believed that this country had done enough for Cuba. This alliance held together during the entire session of Congress in spite of the personal influence brought to bear by President Roosevelt and the pro-Reciprocity members of the Senate. Senator Foraker in a speech spoke of Burrows as the "General from Michigan who had stood his forces up to be counted and sat them down again." The fact that the Sugar Trust was largely interested in Cuban plantations became noised abroad, and in June, 1902, the Administration gave up its attempt to push the Bill through.

Burrows received congratulations from all parts of the country on what was regarded as the greatest feat of his Congressional career, and it was generally considered that the beet sugar industry in this country was safely protected.

The aftermath to this event is interesting from a public standpoint. In the following session of Congress the Cuban Treaty again came under consideration in the Senate, and Burrows was again prepared to defend the American sugar interests. It suddenly developed, however, that there was a notable falling off in the activity and interest of the beet sugar manu-



CARTOON FROM THE DETROIT "JOURNAL"

1902

facturers. Several of the chief protestants against Reciprocity with Cuba went away, giving various reasons for not returning; Senators who, in the previous session, had been encouraged to take up the cause by the representations of these men, now found little influence being brought to bear upon them; data which had been promised to show how the reduction in the tariff would cripple the industry, although promised, failed to be supplied. Finally it leaked out in Washington that several of the leading beet sugar factories in Michigan had been bought by the Sugar Trust, and Senator Burrows now found himself almost without a constituent, when, at the last session, he had been flooded with delegations pleading for his assistance with tears in their eyes. The National Beet Sugar Association expressed itself as willing to stand the small differential in the treaty in favor of Cuban sugar provided this settled the matter for a period of not less than five years. This amendment Senator Burrows succeeded in securing. Article Eight was amended to make the Cuban differential on sugar twenty per cent. for a term of five years. Inasmuch as those representing the beet sugar industry of America expressed themselves satisfied with this arrangement, Burrows withdrew further opposition to the Bill, and it was passed on this basis. Later, how-

ever, individual beet sugar growers saw the mistake they had made, and tried to enlist Senator Burrows' assistance and sympathy; but the treaty had been completed, and, under all the circumstances, perhaps Burrows had lost some of his original enthusiasm.

CHAPTER XI

THE WILSON BILL. 1894

WITH the Democrats in full control of both Houses of Congress and of the Presidency for the first time in over thirty years, they undertook to make good their campaign promises regarding Tariff, and signally failed. It was, of course, unfortunate for them that while the revision was under way Congress itself was so frequently interrupted by petty discussions regarding the Currency, and it also operated against the Party in power to have the revenues themselves cut down because of financial disturbances before any actual progress could be made with the new Tariff Bill. The real difficulty, however, was that the Party could not come to any definite agreement within itself, and President Cleveland was entirely out of sympathy with many of his Party leaders.

The new Tariff measure which became known as the Wilson Bill was in effect a compromise with those Democrats favoring Protection, and, to make it still more unpopular, an income tax was added, which was later declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

The Bill abolished Reciprocity. It became law without the President's signature, and satisfied no one.

Burrows, a minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means at this time, was the chief spokesman against the Bill, and his speech, extracts of which are now given, is of particular value because of the analytical comparison which he makes between the McKinley Bill as misrepresented and as actually in operation, and between the McKinley Bill and the proposed new legislation. In the course of this speech he supported his statements with skilfully selected citations from Daniel Webster and Fisher Ames, Presidents Madison, Adams, Jefferson, and Monroe; from Secretaries Hamilton, Gallatin, Dallas, Crawford, Meredith, and Sherman; from George C. Tichenor, one of the most accomplished and trustworthy Special Agents ever connected with the Treasury Department; from Consuls Mason of Basle, Shaw of Manchester, and Secretary of the Treasury Howell Cobb. The indefatigable study which Burrows put upon the subject matter in his debates gave conclusive strength to his arguments. In this speech, delivered on January 9, 1894, he said:

“The measure now under consideration has for its avowed object a radical modification of the Tariff Act of 1890. It involves not only a change of rates but a complete reversal of an economic policy. The law

of 1890 was enacted not only with a view of securing revenue for the support of the Government, but for the further purpose of giving encouragement to the creation of new enterprises, and protection to American industries and American workmen against unequal and injurious foreign competition. In its practical workings it accomplished both these results. That Act went into effect October 6, 1890, and as a measure for revenue it met, so long as its operation was undisturbed, the needed requirements of the Government. . . .

“Since the 1st of July, 1893, however, there has been a marked decline in the public revenues until they have actually fallen below the requirements for the public service. . . . I venture to suggest, however, in this connection, that this decline in the public revenues during the present fiscal year is not attributable to any defect in the law of 1890, but rather to the general derangement and prostration of business throughout the country. The ascendancy of a political Party pledged to the destruction of our protective policy has not only crippled and suspended the operation of our domestic manufacturers, but the importer of foreign fabrics naturally curtails his importations in the hope of securing their admission into our markets upon more favorable conditions. I confidently assert that if the election of 1892 had resulted in the

retention of the Republican Party in power, accompanied as it would have been with the assurance of the continuance of the American policy of Protection, the effect upon the public revenues as well as the general prosperity of the country would have been entirely reversed. . . . If, however, it had failed to yield the full measure of such requirement, the deficiency could have easily been supplied without disturbing the business interests of the country by a general revision of the tariff. . . .

“As a measure of protection to American industries and American labor, the Act of 1890 in its results more than justified the prediction of its friends. That it would stimulate the development of new enterprises and promote the growth of established industries was confidently asserted, but that its beneficent effect would be so quickly manifest and so marvelous exceeded the highest hopes of the most sanguine. It induced capital to embark in untried ventures, enlarged the field of labor’s profitable employment, augmented our domestic and foreign trade, and quickened with a new life the manifold industries of all our people. . . .

“You said it would develop no new industries,—it created them by the hundreds. You said it would bring no resultant benefits to our workmen,—it secured for them enlarged employment and increased

wages. You said it would enhance the cost of the protected article,—it cheapened it to the consumer. You said it would diminish our foreign trade,—it augmented it in 1892 to \$1,857,680,610, an increase over the previous year of \$128,283,604. You said it would shut out our products from foreign markets,—our export trade increased \$145,797,388, swelling its volume to \$1,030,278,148, the largest ever known in the history of the country, and exceeding the value of our imports by \$202,875,686. You said it would paralyze our domestic trade,—it was never more vigorous than in the years immediately following its enactment. And so every prophecy of ill found swift and complete refutation in increased industrial activity on every hand, and enhanced individual and National prosperity.

“We are therefore justified in asserting that the Act of 1890, could its permanency have been assured, would have accomplished the double purpose for which it was enacted,—revenue and protection. It may be answered, however, that the Tariff Act of 1890 has been in continuous operation since its enactment and is still in force, and yet under it revenues have declined and industries decayed. Conceding this to be true, we deny that the existing deplorable condition of the country is attributable in any degree whatever to the law itself. The McKinley Tariff

never closed a mill in the United States, shut up a mine, stopped a wheel, blew out a furnace fire, or drove a single workman into the streets. This general paralysis of business throughout the country comes solely from the ascendancy of a political Party pledged to the repeal of the Act of 1890, and the substitution therefor of a tariff divested of all protective features. . . .

“How easily you might demonstrate the beneficial effects of restored confidence! You have but to abandon the policy upon which you have entered, recommit this Bill, and permit existing tariff regulations to remain undisturbed, and all our industries will quickly revive. . . .

“The first proposition arresting attention in this Bill is the proposed transfer of one hundred and thirty-one articles from the dutiable to the free list. . . . It will not escape notice in this connection that upon examination of the list of articles thus transferred from the dutiable to the free list the interests of the farmer seem to have been selected for special assault and destruction, as nearly one-half of the items embraced in this proposed transfer are the fruits of domestic husbandry. . . .

“Such a proposition would at any time arrest public attention, but to be made in the presence of a depleted Treasury, and with its Secretary asking to

be clothed with power to issue bonds on which he may borrow money to meet the current expenses of the Government, is a proposition so startling as to challenge the credulity of mankind. There is only one explanation possible, and that is found in the exclamation of an English statesman: 'It is Free Trade gone mad.' The present free list ought to be sufficient to satisfy the demands of the most advanced Free-Trader. The Act of 1890 enlarged it to the very limit of safety to American industries and American labor. . . .

"Heretofore if there was any one class of our people the Democratic Party inveighed against more than another it was the manufacturer, but he has now, it seems, become the object of your deepest solicitude, while the humble laborer, for whom you have professed so much anxiety in the past, is abandoned to an unequal battle with his foreign antagonists. The hardy miner, the intelligent flock-master and farmer, and all the producers of what you are pleased to call 'raw materials,' are to be forced to contend unaided with the cheapest labor on the globe, that the manufacturer may enjoy the boon of 'free raw material.'

"Why should not the producers of raw material be accorded the same consideration as the manufacturer of that material into his finished product? Why should the miner in his perilous vocation be utterly

abandoned, while the workers in the raw material which he produces are given some measure of consideration? Why should the farmer, having invested his all in fields and flocks, be forced into an unequal competition with Australia and South America, while the manufacturer of woollen fabrics secures some measure of protection? And in this connection it is but just to say that the woollen manufacturers as a body demand no such unjustifiable discrimination.

“But I notice every ‘Tariff Reformer’ urges free raw material as an indispensable adjunct to the summation of his theory. ‘There is method in his madness.’ No one understands better than he that free raw material will be swiftly followed by free manufactured goods. It will be protection for all or protection for none. When you force the producers of raw material unto unrestrained competition with the world, the manufacturers of this raw material into the finished fabric will speedily share the same fate. . . .

“The iron in the mountain, the coal in its native bed, the trees in the forest, the stone in the quarry,—these are raw material in their natural condition, and untouched by the hand of labor would remain raw material forever, and continue absolutely valueless. But when labor touches them, and transforms them to

the uses of mankind, that moment they cease to be raw material, and become the finished product of invested capital and expended labor. You may continue to delude yourself with the theory that these things are raw material, but you will not deceive the intelligent labor of this country, through whose mighty energies they are produced. . . .

“We of the minority intend to resist to the last this wanton destruction of American interests. We believe in the development of all our industrial resources to the fullest extent, and to that end would extend the same measure of protection to the producers of raw material as to the workers in the more advanced product. We would not only be independent of foreigners for our manufactured goods, but for the raw material out of which they are fabricated. I can conceive of no policy more detrimental to American manufacturers and American labor than the abandonment of the production so far as possible of our own raw material. Such a policy would not only drive labor from the largest field of its employment, but it would dry up one of the most bountiful sources of National wealth, and reduce our manufacturing industries to complete dependence on foreign nations for the supply of their raw material.

“Such a result would be disastrous even to the interests it is proposed to promote; for when we have

slaughtered our flocks, closed our mines, and wholly abandoned the production of our own raw material, the foreigner would take advantage of our helpless condition and impose upon us whatever burden his cupidity might suggest. We, therefore, would protect all interests, whether of the mine or the furnace, the field or the factory, to the end that all our people may receive profitable employment, and the Nation attain its highest possible development. . . .

“Passing from the consideration of the free list to the dutiable schedules, we find here the same spirit of hostility manifested in every provision. There is not a schedule in which there are not some industries which will be imperiled by the passage of this Bill,—many will be utterly destroyed. On the other hand, if there is any provision in this Bill which will stimulate a single domestic industry, or give increased employment to labor, it has not been pointed out. The measure as a whole looks only to lessened industries and lower wages. It ought to be entitled ‘A Bill to lessen the revenue, destroy American industries, and pauperize American labor.’ The majority seem to have been actuated only by the desire to lower duties all along the line, regardless of the consequences to American industries or American labor. . . . I have only to say that the Bill as a whole is as unscientific as it is un-American. . . .

"I shall not pause to call attention to the many incongruities in this Bill. . . . There is one criticism I would not venture to make, but as it comes from the Troy *Daily Times*, I ask the Clerk to read the following:

"The framers of the Wilson Bill having classified hydraulic hose, which is used exclusively for extinguishing fires, among articles of wearing apparel, no doubt will remodel that extraordinary measure so as to include hydraulic rams and spinning-mules in the live-stock schedule.'

"The most startling feature connected with and running through the entire dutiable schedules is the general substitution of *ad valorem* for specific rates. Under existing law, duties are imposed wherever possible by the yard, pound, or quantity and not according to value. The object of this was to avoid undervaluations and insure an honest collection of the revenues. It was to protect not only the revenues of the Government but our domestic manufactures as well. In the Committee's Bill this policy is abandoned, and five hundred specific rates have been changed to *ad valorem*. If anything was needed in addition to lowered duties to complete the destruction of our protective system, it is supplied by the substitution of *ad valorem* for specific rates. Under such a policy, coupled with the reductions proposed, revenue and

domestic industries will alike diminish, and the latter in many instances disappear. . . . In all continental nations excepting the Netherlands *ad valorem* tariffs have been substantially discarded. France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Sweden and Norway, Russia, Switzerland, Belgium, Portugal, and Spain, as the result of long experience with both systems, have settled down to the collection of their customs revenues almost wholly to a specific basis. It is more than folly, therefore, to attempt to foist upon this country a system condemned by a century of our own history and the experience of the leading European nations.

“It is not surprising, however, that the Party of Free Trade in the United States should make this method of levying duties the leading feature of its policy. It is a fit accompaniment to this Bill. It removes the last safeguard to American industries, and strikes down the last hope for our protective system. If there was nothing else in this measure deserving public condemnation, this alone ought to be sufficient to insure its overwhelming defeat.

“But the members of the majority seek to secure public approval for the destruction of specific duties by pluming themselves with a show of lessened *ad valorem*s, hoping thereby to divert public attention and secure popular applause. . . . Let me say that the

masses of the people, however, at this time are not specially enthusiastic over the prospects of lower *ad valorem*s. Our workmen are not searching for low *ad valorem*s, but for employment. Shivering by desolate hearths over the expiring embers of the last handful of coal, they are not solicitous about *ad valorem*, but fuel. Starving families, clutching for the last morsel of food, cannot be lulled into forgetfulness of present misery by the announcement of lower *ad valorem*s on the necessities of life. Tramping the streets, out of employment, receiving alms, lower *ad valorem*s will not heal the wounded pride of the brave men who never before were dependent on public charity. The laboring people of this country ask not lower *ad valorem*s, but work. They prefer high *ad valorem*s, constant employment, and abundant wages, to low *ad valorem*s, idleness, and want. . . .

“I implore you to abandon this suicidal policy. Have you not pursued it far enough to become convinced of its disastrous consequences? It is no longer an experiment,—it has become a public crime. You have it within your power instantly to relieve this appalling situation. You have only to substitute for the pending measure a joint resolution declaratory of your purpose to maintain existing law in full force and effect during the continuance of this Administration, and business activity would instantly take the place of

business depression. It would arrest the slaughter of our flocks, open our mines, relight the fires of our furnaces, unchain the wheels of our industries, start every spindle and loom; while whistles and factory bells would call the tramping, starving millions back from enforced idleness to profitable employment, and the American Republic would leap with a bound to its accustomed place in the van of industrial nations."

As Burrows came to a close, the applause upon the floor and in the galleries was so stupendous and prolonged that the speaker was obliged to call the House to order. "The Chair begs to remind our visiting friends in the galleries," he said, "that such demonstrations are not allowable under the rules, and a repetition of them will warrant the Chair in having the galleries cleared. The Sergeant-at-Arms will be directed to remove visitors from the galleries unless they cease their demonstrations."

To this stricture a member of the House retorted, "They vote, Mr. Speaker!"

The Wilson Bill was passed by the House by a vote of nearly two to one. Seventeen Democrats voted against it, and this dissension presented it to the Upper House without the united backing of the majority Party of the Lower. In the Senate, the Democrats had a working majority of only three over the Republicans and Populists combined, and here Sen-

ator Gorman, of Maryland, and Senator Bryce, of Ohio, started in to modify the Bill in principle as well as in detail. By the time iron ore, coal, and sugar were taken off the free list, specific duties on many commodities restored in place of *ad valorem*s, and rates generally advanced upon many other articles, the Bill as returned to the House was hardly recognizable. President Cleveland declared that the distorted document represented "Party perfidy and Party dishonor." The Democrats had shown themselves clearly afraid to break away from Protection, and the result of the contest left them in a position as undignified as it was humiliating. Even friends of tariff revision in the Party admitted that it would have been better to continue the McKinley Tariff rather than to endorse this nondescript attempt at reform.

CHAPTER XII

CURRENCY. 1874-1896

WE saw in an earlier chapter ¹ that the financial panic of 1873 turned the attention of the country away from the reconstruction of the South, and focused it upon the subject of the Currency. We also saw the far-reaching political effect of this reaction in throwing the control of Congress in the elections of 1874 into Democratic hands for the first time since 1860. Burrows, therefore, received the force of this reaction as his baptism in political finance. He had taken part, as a fledgling in the Forty-third Congress, in the discussion of the "Inflation Bill," and had paid his penalty for standing behind the greenback; from the side lines he had watched Secretary Bristow force the Bill for the resumption of specie payments through the expiring Forty-seventh Congress, recommending, (1) a system of free banking, (2) the retiring of greenbacks equal to eighty per cent. of the new bank notes issued until the \$382,000,000 of greenbacks in existence should be reduced to \$300,000,000, (3) the withdrawal of fractional

¹ See *ante*, page 151.

paper money and the substitution of silver coin, (4) the abolishment of the charge for gold coinage, (5) the resumption of specie payments on January 1, 1879; he had seen, still from the outside, Resumption actually accomplished, under John Sherman as Secretary of the Treasury, the despised greenbacks touching par a fortnight before the appointed date. That Burrows was closely following these events is evidenced by the following extract from a speech he made at Madison, Wisconsin, during the campaign which returned him to Congress:

“We entered upon a process of paying these greenbacks,” he explained, “and then the Democratic Party turned around and said, ‘That is unconstitutional; you must not pay them. Give us more!’ Almost the whole Democratic Party today is drifting and sliding and slopping over for more greenbacks. We don’t want any more. We want to pay these notes; that is what we promised to do, that is what we are bound to do. Now the Democrats say, ‘Let us have this question to manage, and we will take care of them,’—but so will we! We have not forgotten what they said about that greenback once when that little fellow was first born. His head was puny. He looked as though he would not live. We have not forgotten that they leaned over the cradle of his infancy and said, ‘That is a Lincoln scab.’ And some

of them were so ungenerous as to suggest that it was an unconstitutional boy. But it was our child. We claimed him, we stood by him; they hissed him and called him hard names. He only weighed about thirty-three pounds then, but under the guardianship and care of the Republican Party he has steadily ascended the rugged heights of Resumption, until today, in spite of the Democratic Party, he weighs one hundred pounds, and stands upon the summit, wearing a crown of gold and sandals of silver. All we ask of our Democratic friends is to let him alone!"

The fact that this achievement was finally accomplished cannot be wholly attributed to the financial wisdom and skill of Secretary Sherman, although he was entitled to the greatest credit for the firmness and tact displayed throughout. It should be remembered, however, that in 1878, for the first time, the United States was selling in foreign markets more than it was buying. This condition was favorable to the importation and the retention of gold, and the fall of prices which came with Resumption itself assisted in attracting gold back to the United States.

From 1879 to 1888 the Currency question attracted only luke-warm interest. Occasionally there was a discussion as to the suspension of purchases under the Bland Act, or to providing a still freer coinage; but this attracted only slight attention on the part of the

people. President Cleveland himself was distinctly in favor of such suspension, and warned his Party and the country at large of the crisis which was sure to come through the increased burden being placed upon the gold reserve. Even this had little effect except to antagonize the Silver faction of the Democratic Party.

The prosperity of the country during 1885 and 1886 was the dust in the eyes of those who accepted the arguments of the advocates of the Bland Bill at face value. During these years the excess of gold exports amounted to \$40,000,000, but during the next two years a balance of \$59,000,000 came back. The years 1887 and 1888 were spoken of as "of great industrial activity," and 1889 "surpassed all its predecessors in the general volume of trade movements."¹

As a matter of fact, a large proportion in both the Lower House and in the Senate were in favor of Silver, but the majority Senatorial attitude had not developed to a point where it cared to adopt free coinage. That element which had been behind the craze for greenbacks, checked in 1874 by President Grant, saw in the remonetization of silver an opportunity to accomplish nearly the same purpose.

The Act of 1873 officially discontinued the coinage of the silver dollar, and this, for years to come, was

¹ *Dewey*: "Financial History of the United States," page 412.

spoken of as the "Crime of 1873." In this Act the silver dollar mentioned contained 420 grains, and at that time the metal in the coin was actually worth more as bullion than the sum it represented. A year later, however, a fall in the price of silver changed the situation, and the fluctuations gave the silver dollar a value greater than its intrinsic worth.

Unlimited free coinage of silver would, of course, expand the currency, and all the advocates of this cause now showed an equal enthusiasm for silver. The leader of the Silver forces was Richard P. Bland, of Missouri, and his Bill passed the House of Representatives November 5, 1877, by a vote of 163 to 34. In the Senate, however, a limit was placed upon the volume of coinage, owing to the influence of Senator Allison: it made the silver dollar again full legal tender, and gave the Secretary of the Treasury authority to purchase silver bullion at market price in quantities of from \$2,000,000 to \$4,000,000 worth per month to be coined into dollars. Silver certificates were also authorized. President Hayes vetoed this Bill, but it was passed over his veto. This Act required a minimum expenditure of \$24,000,000 a year in purchasing a commodity which was falling in value, and which must inevitably become a lien upon the gold assets of the country.

Burrows was not in Congress at the time the Bland-

Allison Bill was passed, but as it continued in operation until 1890 he had ample opportunity to follow the results of its enactment. In 1884, McCulloch, Secretary of the Treasury, announced that unless the coinage of silver dollars was suspended there was danger that silver and not gold would become the metallic standard; in the following year Secretary Manning warned Congress that the hoarding of gold had already begun, and recommended the suspension of a compulsory coinage. In spite of this, the legislators pursued the even tenor of their way, while the people became more and more restless without fully realizing what it was which was operating unfavorably upon their previous business prosperity.

By 1890 the people awoke to the situation, and for the next eight years the Currency question became the most serious political problem. With Harrison's election Congress felt the pressure of its constituents sufficiently to take immediate action, and the Sherman Silver Purchasing Act and the McKinley Tariff Act came before its members during the same session. This was in a way unfortunate, as it was inevitable that certain compromises had to be made on both sides in order to secure the passage of both Bills.

The Sherman Act, which finally passed July 14, 1890, differed from the Bland Act in the following points: the monthly purchase of silver was increased;

treasury notes were to be full instead of partial legal tender; treasury notes could be redeemed at the discretion of the Secretary in either gold or silver coin. After July 1, 1891, standard silver dollars were to be coined only as necessary for the redemption of the notes.

It will be seen by this that the Sherman Law, while providing for the purchase of all the American product of silver, did not admit unlimited coinage. The Act declared for the maintenance of gold and silver on a parity each with the other. By the Bland Act the annual addition to the currency grew larger as the price of silver fell; by the Sherman Act the annual additions grew less.

The passage of the Sherman Law of 1890 caused untold confusion in the ranks of the Republican Party. It was distinctly a compromise, conceding much to the Silver element, and yet failing to satisfy them, while the Sound Money wing of the Party fully realized the danger contained in the concessions which had been made. President Cleveland complained that it provided an endless chain, as the notes were presented for redemption, paid out, and then again redeemed until the gold reserve was nearly exhausted. Even Bland, the author of the earlier Act of 1878, and still the father of Free Silver in Congress, pronounced the Act "a masterpiece of duplicity and double dealing."

With the passing of the McKinley Tariff Act the Sound Money Republicans in 1891 undertook to repeal the Sherman Silver Purchasing Act, and Sherman himself acknowledged that the law had proved ineffective. These efforts, however, proved unsuccessful, while the Silver element in the Fifty-second Congress nearly succeeded in passing through a *bona fide* Free Coinage Bill reported by Bland, who was at this time Chairman of the Committee on Coinage. That this Bill was not passed through was due wholly to Burrows, and the episode itself is one of the most interesting which ever occurred in Congress. As far as Burrows is concerned, it is a further evidence of his astuteness as a parliamentarian. The episode is described in *Harper's Weekly*, of April 9, 1892:

“When Mr. Crisp was elected Speaker of the Federal House of Representatives no well-informed person doubted that a Free Coinage Bill would be passed by that body. The anti-Silver Democrats based their hopes on the Senate, and especially on the Senate Finance Committee, which was known to be disposed to settle the Silver issue by means of an International Monetary Conference. The character of Mr. Crisp’s Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures only confirmed the belief that a Free Coinage Bill would pass the House as the same Bill passed it in 1878.

“The fight on the Silver question has been in

progress ever since the opening of the session. The Tariff question, which, it was anticipated, would afford the leading topic of discussion, was pushed into the background. The Ways and Means Committee did not take the lead of the House in legislation. The meetings of the Coinage Committee became more interesting than those of any other committee. Mr. Bland's purposes were known; there was no question as to where he would stand. For nearly twenty years he had been knocking at the statute-book for the admission of a Free Coinage Act. But with his followers it was different. Some of them, it is true, were as sincere and honest advocates of Free Coinage as Mr. Bland. Others were for the Bill because their constituents were believed to demand the free coinage of Silver. These two classes were not to be moved by argument or entreaty. Their consciences or their interests stood in the way. There was a third and large class, however, who believed that it was 'good politics' to advocate Free Silver. Upon this class the anti-Silver men worked. Neglecting for the time the merits of the question, they appealed to the Free Silver men as Democrats, and undertook to prove to them that the introduction of the Free Silver issue into the Presidential campaign would necessarily complicate the contest, would divert the struggle from the issues on which the Democrats had won their great majority

in Congress in the elections of 1890, and would endanger, if not destroy Democratic chances in the three Eastern States,—New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, and in the hopeful group of States of the Northwest, at the head of which stands Wisconsin, whose Democratic Legislature had pronounced emphatically against Free Coinage.

“Finally the vote on the question of considering the Bland Bill was taken, and the majority in favor of the proposition was discouraging. It seemed as though the work of persuasion and argument had gone for nothing. Nevertheless, the fight was maintained. Telegrams, letters, and petitions poured in. Through the efforts of the *New York World*, begun within four days of the time set for consideration, a petition signed by 6000 Democrats was presented. It urged the postponement of the Bill until after the Presidential election. This appeal to Party loyalty was for a time unheeded. The debate began on Tuesday, March 22, and proceeded until Thursday afternoon, when Mr. Bland moved the previous question. To this time the Free Coinage men had confidently counted on a majority of forty on the final vote.

“Then it was discovered that the work of the anti-Silver men had accomplished wonderful results. To the surprise of every one, Mr. Burrows, of Michigan, the cleverest parliamentarian on the Republican side

of the House, moved to lay the Bill on the table. The Speaker himself was astonished at the audacity of the motion, and Mr. Burrows was obliged to call his attention to the rule in order to convince him that a motion to lay on the table takes precedence of a motion for the previous question. The Speaker acquiesced, although he must have been reluctant, for throughout the whole evening he plainly showed that it was his purpose to force the passage of the Bill if it was in his power to do so. Speaker Crisp is a determined man, and believes in doing his utmost for the cause in which he is for the moment enlisted. As the roll-call went on the excitement in the House became intense, for it was seen that the vote would be very close, and the fate of the Bill would be settled if Mr. Burrows prevailed. As it turned out, the vote was 148 for tabling and 147 against. The Speaker's vote was needed, and he gave it, making the vote a tie. As a majority was required to lay the Bill on the table, Mr. Burrows' motion was defeated.

“The surprise of the Free Silver men was complete, and their anger was intense. They were ready to adopt any method that would secure the passage of their favorite measure. They were even ready, as it turned out subsequently, to resort to practices that in the last Congress they denounced as tyrannical. Mr. Bland himself seemed dazed. Mr. Outhwaite moved

to adjourn. If that motion had been carried, the Bill would have been displaced. Mr. Bland rallied, and defeated the motion, the Republicans helping him. Then Tom Johnson, of Ohio, who voted with the Free Silver men for the purpose, moved to reconsider the vote by which Mr. Burrows' motion was lost. Mr. Bland moved to table Johnson's motion. He was now in his turn defeated by a tie vote, 145 to 145, so that the anti-Silver men had another opportunity to table the Bill.

"And now came a great wrangle with the Speaker. On the previous roll-calls he had on his own motion ordered the clerk to recapitulate the vote, that is, to read it over for the correction of errors. On Johnson's motion he simply announced the vote, and declared it lost by a tie vote of 148 to 148. The announcement was greeted by a storm of indignation. Members shouted their protests. Demands for a recapitulation were made. The Speaker denied them, on the ground that they were made after the result of the vote was declared. He was reminded that he had himself ordered the recapitulation on previous votes, and that on this occasion he had given no opportunity for a demand. He was angrily told that the vote as declared was wrong. Finally Mr. Bland, with the fairness that characterized him throughout, said that if any member doubted the accuracy of the

count he hoped that there would be a recapitulation. The Speaker acceded, and the recapitulation showed errors enough to carry Johnson's motion.

"Burrows' motion then came up once more, was then lost, and after a parliamentary struggle Mr. Bland himself moved the adjournment. The Bill was subsequently killed for the session by the Speaker's refusal to apply *clôture*.

"In this exciting parliamentary struggle Mr. Bourke Cockran was the conspicuous figure on the Democratic side. His was the voice and presence and tireless energy. With him were Tracey, Fitch, and Warner, of New York, and George Fred Williams, of Massachusetts, while aiding him with their great parliamentary resources were ex-Speaker Reed and Burrows. It was a great victory nobly won."

A full page cartoon in *Puck* amusingly illustrates the public importance of Burrows' strategy. He himself gives the following explanation of the episode:

"In the Silver fight I put the motion to lay the Bill on the table. This was to place on record those Democrats who were manœuvering to side-track the Bill without committing themselves on the question at issue. Then I voted myself, and instructed my allies to vote against the motion,—that was, for the consideration of the Bill, though opposing the policy it advocated. This was to force Democrats who were

PUCK.



A MEMORABLE KNOCKOUT
MAY 21, 1892.

CARTOON FROM "PUCK"

1892

still trying to straddle the question to take a final stand, from which there would be no hope of retreat. It was urged that in this I juggled with a vital principle, but inasmuch as I knew the Bill could not become a law there was ultimately possible no sacrifice of any public interest, and the end to be gained was confusion added to the defeat of the enemy."

At the National Conventions in 1892 the platforms of both Parties were intentionally ambiguous on the subject of Free Coinage, but each demanded parity in the value of gold and silver. Almost before the National Convention had adjourned, the Senate again passed a Bill for the unlimited coinage of silver, but it was killed in the House by a vote of 154 to 136. The renomination of Cleveland for President, and his well-known views against Free Coinage, undoubtedly influenced the Democratic Representatives.

The facts connected with the panic of 1893 make it the most difficult to analyze of any of the panics which have overtaken the United States. The year 1892 was conspicuous because the volume of its business transactions went beyond that of any other year in the history of the country; all records were broken in trade with foreign countries; railroads increased their tonnage; there was a favorable money market in relation to business; and the record of business failures was the smallest for ten years. Students of

commercial affairs who were able to see below the surface found it impossible to convince the people that other conditions existed which made it certain that there was trouble ahead. The average man, whose business was progressing under prosperous conditions, not being a student of finance, found it difficult to understand that the continuation of heavy gold exports was significant.

When the Philadelphia & Reading Railroad went into bankruptcy, quickly followed by the stock panic of January 20, 1893, it became apparent that the signs which had been accepted as those of prosperity were merely superficial. By April 15 Secretary of the Treasury Carlisle issued a notice that further issue of gold certificates for gold in the Treasury would be suspended, this action being necessitated by the fact that the gold reserve had fallen below \$100,000,000. A week later, President Cleveland declared that every power of the Administration would be exercised "to keep the public faith and to preserve the parity between gold and silver, and between all financial obligations of the Government." The financial horizon during the next two months became darker and darker, failures following one another until each man who had succeeded in protecting his own solvency wondered if his own turn would not come next. It became necessary for banks in New York, Boston, and

Philadelphia to issue clearing-house certificates in place of currency, and when, on top of all, the British Government closed the mints of India to the free coinage of silver, it became obvious that silver could not be supported by any international agreement. By August, currency had reached a premium of three per cent.

Congress was called in extra session on August 7. When it convened, President Cleveland asked the absolute repeal of the Sherman Silver Purchase Law, and the House of Representatives responded promptly to his demand. Burrows took an active part in the debate, and the following extracts from his speech, delivered on August 25, 1893, give an excellent picture of the conditions and a comprehensive statement of the situation:

“On the 30th day of June just past, and within a period of less than four months from the time the Democratic Party assumed full control of the executive and legislative branches of the National Government, the President of the United States publicly announced to the country and the world that ‘there is general distrust and apprehension concerning the financial situation of the country; that it pervades all business circles; that it has already caused great loss and damage to our people; and that it threatens to cripple our merchants, stop the wheels of manufac-

tures, bring distress and privation to our farmers, and to withhold from our workmen the wage of labor'; and that he is therefore constrained 'to convene Congress in extraordinary session to the end that the people may be relieved, through legislation, from pending danger and distress.'

"Forty days later, and on the 8th day of the present month, the President, by message, advises the assembled Congress that 'there exists an alarming and extraordinary business situation involving the welfare and prosperity of all our people,' and that he had convened Congress that the 'present evils may be mitigated and dangers threatening the future may be averted.'

"These conditions as thus described by the President are not today materially changed. There exists at this time the same 'alarming business situation,' the same 'dangers' seem to be 'threatening the future,' and if the President of the United States could for a moment have his attention diverted from his piscatorial sports at Buzzards Bay he would not only observe the continuance of this deplorable condition, but if he would listen he would hear the ominous tramp of a multitude of the unemployed which no man can number, fresh from the mine and the factory, carrying above them now not the delusive banner of 'Tariff Reform,' but the black flag of distress and despera-

tion, and demanding food for themselves and their dependent families.

“Such is the startling condition existing in our country today. . . . What is it that in the brief space of six months has plunged this Nation, with all its colossal interests, from the summit of prosperity and hope to the depths of adversity and despair? When we know the cause we can intelligently apply the remedy. . . .

“The President of the United States, in his proclamation convening Congress, declared that ‘this condition is the result of a distrust and apprehension concerning the financial condition of the country, and that it is the outgrowth of a financial policy embodied in unwise laws which he is compelled to execute until repealed.’ The country was left in much uncertainty as to the laws referred to in this proclamation, but the message removes all doubt by specifying the Act of 1890, commonly known as the Sherman Law, as the fruitful source of all our woes. While I am frank to admit that that measure in its practical workings has been a disappointment to its friends, yet I do not believe that it is responsible in any considerable degree for the deplorable condition in which we find the country today.

“It will be remembered we commenced buying silver under that Act on the 13th day of August, 1890,

and we continued these purchases through 1890, 1891, and 1892, without any alarming symptoms of approaching disaster; and not until after the Presidential election last November did the business interests of the country take alarm, and stringency in the money market begin to appear. If the operation of this law is the fruitful source of the widespread disaster we witness today, is it not a little remarkable that it was not made manifest during the first two years of its existence? I cannot believe that this deplorable condition is to be attributed to an Act which increased the circulation of this country more than three millions of dollars a month in good, sound currency; and I cannot believe that labor has been driven out of employment and into the street because of the bad character of our money. I do not believe the people hide money, as they are doing now and have been for the last sixty days, because they have any suspicions as to the soundness of that currency.

“I do not believe that great business enterprises have been abandoned, once prosperous industries shut down, because of a suspicion that our money was not secure. The fact is that at this very moment our entire volume of currency, whether of gold, silver, or paper, is worth one hundred cents on a dollar, every dollar being kept at a parity with every other dollar. I am constrained to believe that the real cause of this

widespread business depression is attributable chiefly to the hostile attitude of the Democratic Party toward our protective policy, under which for the last thirty years the Nation has wrought its marvelous industrial independence. This money stringency, which is of recent date, was, it will be remembered, preceded by business paralysis all over the country.

“As soon as the result of the last Presidential election was known, and that the people had actually affirmed the declaration of the Democratic platform that a Protective Tariff was ‘unconstitutional,’ and that hereafter we were to have a ‘tariff for revenue only’ with no element of protection in it, that moment the manufacturers put out their fires, labor was reduced in its employment or wholly discharged, men abandoned great business enterprises which they had in contemplation, and in every way curtailed their expenses that they might save something from the general wreck which was sure to follow the inauguration of Free Trade in this country.

“I have heard it suggested that this could not be the cause for the reason that as yet there had been no change in our tariff law. Neither has there been any change in our financial policy, and yet the President declares that there is an ‘apprehension’ as to our financial situation which is the ‘fruitful source’ of our present disorder. So I say it is the ‘apprehen-

sion' of a change in our industrial policy that has brought this general suspension of business and universal distrust. Apprehension of danger is sufficient to put prudent men on their guard. Would it be necessary for a person actually to go over Niagara Falls to be convinced that the expedition is attended with disastrous consequences? If a Party in this country today should declare in favor of the enslavement of the black race, and that Party receive the indorsement of the people on that issue, would it not occasion much trepidation among the people of color? The people are not ignorant of the results which would follow the inauguration of Free Trade in this country. We have had three periods of a low-revenue tariff during our National existence,—1816, 1832, 1847,—and each one of these eras was attended with general distress and bankruptcy, supplemented with the most serious panics this country has ever seen. . . .

“But, whatever the cause, the situation is before us, and we must deal with it as best we can. It is unfortunate that the House in all its membership is not free to legislate. The President in his proclamation convening Congress invited ‘all those who are entitled to act as members of the Fifty-third Congress to convene in extra session,’ but under a rule adopted by the majority, without consultation with the minority, no member of the minority is permitted to offer any

amendment to the propositions suggested by the majority. So far as legislation is concerned, or any suggestions from the minority, we might as well have remained at home. We can only vote with one or the other of the warring factions of the Democratic Party, and only on the propositions which they in their wisdom have seen fit to submit.

“What are these propositions? *First*, the repeal of the Act of 1890, known as the Sherman Law; *second*, the reënactment of the law of 1878, known as the Bland-Allison Law; and *third*, the free and unlimited coinage of silver upon some agreed ratio from 16 to 20 to 1.

“Upon the first proposition, to repeal the purchase clause of the Sherman Act, I have no hesitancy in giving it my support, for the reason that it is unsound in principle, and in its practical workings it has disappointed its friends, and if continued would, in my judgment, result disastrously to the country. . . . In the execution of this law all Secretaries of the Treasury have redeemed these notes in gold. The practical workings, therefore, of this measure result in exchanging the gold in the Treasury for silver bullion.

“The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Hooker) the other day suggested that these Treasury notes ought to be redeemed in silver dollars, and that the Secretary of the Treasury has erred in insisting on

their redemption in gold. A moment's reflection I am sure will satisfy the gentleman that his position is not tenable. . . . These notes represent gold values, and for the Government of the United States to redeem them in silver dollars worth fifty-seven cents, would be a piece of financial dishonesty which ought to discredit a Government as it would certainly disgrace an individual. In the next place, if the present Secretary of the Treasury had carried out what was reputed at one time to be his intentions,—to redeem these Treasury notes in coined silver,—he would at once have landed this Government on a silver basis, and seriously impaired its now unquestioned credit. And I venture to suggest, in passing, that the rumored purpose of the Secretary of the Treasury in this regard sounded the note of alarm in our great money and business centers.

“Now, what has been the resultant effect of this purchase clause of the Sherman Act? We made our first purchase of silver under it on the 13th day of August, 1890, and from that day until August 13, 1893, a period of exactly three years, we purchased 162,102,772 ounces of silver bullion, equal to 5,558 tons, and we issued in payment therefor notes of the Government, today outstanding, of \$151,081,492, every one of which must be redeemed by the Treasury of the United States in gold. Does it need any

argument to show that the continuation of such a policy as that would result in depleting the Treasury of the United States of every dollar of gold we possess, and putting in its stead a mountain of uncoined silver bullion? When the paper given for this bullion must be redeemed in gold, is there any question that gold will disappear from the Treasury as fast as these notes are presented for redemption? It needs no argument to show that this policy cannot be continued as a permanent financial system. It must be abandoned sooner or later, and the sooner it is abandoned the less will be the loss sustained by the Government.

“This silver bullion in the Treasury of the United States is absolutely useless. We cannot coin it, because the law does not permit it; neither can we sell it, and if we were to sell it at the market price of silver bullion today—72 cents an ounce—that for which we paid \$151,081,492 would bring only \$116,713,895, entailing a loss upon the Government of \$34,367,597. The loss, however, would probably far exceed that, for if we should authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to put this silver on the market and dispose of it, that moment silver would decline to a point hitherto unknown in its history, and the loss to the Government would be simply incalculable.

“It was argued in favor of the passage of this law at the time of its enactment that the reason why silver

had declined was because the Government had discarded it in a large measure, and was only coining it in limited quantities, and it was contended that if we would utilize more of the silver that it would advance its price and more readily bring it to a parity with gold, whereby its free coinage could be safely authorized. But time has demonstrated that this assumption was without foundation, for on the 13th day of August, 1890, we paid for our first purchase of silver under this Act \$1.13 an ounce, and on the 13th day of August, 1893, we paid $73\frac{1}{2}$ cents an ounce, showing a decline in three years of 40 cents an ounce, while during this same period the highest price we paid for silver was on the 27th of August, 1890, when we paid $\$1.20\frac{1}{4}$, and the lowest on July 24, 1893, when we paid $69\frac{3}{4}$ cents per ounce, a difference between the highest and lowest price of 50 cents an ounce.

“But this law, it is said, serves to increase the currency. We purchase silver and give our notes, which are made a legal tender, and which pass into the monetary circulation of the country. While this is true, I venture to say that that is an unwise financial policy which runs the Government in debt for a product it cannot use for the purpose of increasing its volume of money. No government on the face of this earth ever adopted such a policy as that but our own, and I doubt if a like policy can be found in all history.

We might as well buy copper, or iron, or wheat, or any other product that the Government cannot use, store it in Government warehouses, and issue our promise to pay therefor to be used as money. We certainly ought to be able in some way to supply the people of this country with a sufficient volume of currency without resorting to a method so questionable as this. We ought to be able to increase our circulation without increasing our debts. I shall, therefore, vote cheerfully for the repeal of the purchase clause of the Sherman Act, because I believe it to be unsound in principle, and if continued will be attended with disastrous results.

“But the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Hepburn) would not repeal this Act because it would be a confession that it was the cause of the present disaster. By no means. I am aware the Democratic Party attributes the present condition to the Sherman Law, and that is an additional reason why I would repeal it. I would tear down this shelter and drive the Democratic Party out into the open, where it will be confronted with the evidences of its disastrous Tariff policy.

“I have heard it intimated, and by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Bryan),¹ himself a member of the Democratic Party, that this ought not to be

¹ This was Mr. Bryan's first appearance in behalf of Free Silver.

repealed until something is agreed upon to take its place, and the gentleman from Nebraska announces that the message of the President favoring the repeal of this law is the 'burial of silver,' and then exclaims: 'Abandon hope, all you who enter here!' Let me say to my young friend that that is an old sign that has been hanging on the outer wall of the Democratic Party for over fifty years, and I am surprised he has just discovered it. . . .

"If the Democratic Party does not continue both gold and silver in our monetary system, and maintain that money at a parity, then they are false to Party pledges, and will be rebuked by the people. The Republican Party is in favor of bimetallism—of the use of both gold and silver in our monetary system; and it not only believes in it, but it has legislated so as to secure it. For fifteen years we have maintained gold and silver at a parity, and today we have four hundred and nineteen millions of coined silver dollars; one hundred and fifty-one millions of Treasury notes representing silver purchased, or nearly six hundred millions of silver currency which we are maintaining in our circulation on a parity with gold, and propose to maintain it as a part of our monetary circulation, thus utilizing both gold and silver, and keeping them at a parity.

"In the face of this legislation on the part of the

Republican Party, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Bryan), I have no doubt, joined his Party in the last election in denouncing this policy of the Republican Party as a 'cowardly makeshift,' and appealed to the people to overthrow that parity in the interest of a Party pledged to establish a wiser and safer financial policy. The opportunity is now with you to redeem your pledges, and continue to utilize both gold and silver in our monetary system, and maintain bimetalism as we have safely established it.

"The next proposition submitted by the majority is the restoration of the Act of 1878. I shall not detain the House long with a discussion of this proposition. That was an Act which directed the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase at least two million dollars' worth of silver bullion every month and coin it into standard silver dollars at $412\frac{1}{2}$ grains. The only material difference between that Act and the Act of 1890 is that the former required the silver purchased to be coined, and the Act of 1890 does not. And if there are degrees of evil, then the Act of 1878 is worse than the Act of 1890; for under it we were coining $371\frac{1}{4}$ grains of pure silver into a silver dollar, and with the stamp of the Government certifying it to be a dollar, when intrinsically it was worth much less. Under the operations of that Act we coined \$378,166,793, and that, together with the coinage of

the trade dollar and the coinage under the Act of 1890, makes a sum total of silver coinage already stated at \$419,294,835.

“Yet of this vast sum of coined silver dollars the Secretary of the Treasury advises us that on the 1st day of June, this year, only \$58,000,000 of it was in circulation, the balance being in the Treasury of the United States, and represented in our circulation by silver certificates. If the coin will not circulate, as seems to be the case, why convert the bullion into coin? Better continue the present law, purchase silver and issue our notes therefor. But one of the most effective arguments used at the time in favor of the passage of the Act of 1878 was that we demonetized silver in 1873, and that Act caused silver to depreciate, and that if we would remonetize it even in part it would at once advance the price of silver and bring it to a parity with gold.

“It has been demonstrated that this assumption was without foundation, for while the value of the bullion in the silver dollar in 1877 was 92 cents, after twelve years of coinage, in 1889, the silver in the silver dollar was worth only 72 cents, or the value of the bullion in the silver dollar at the end of twelve years had declined 20 cents.

“When this Bill was passed in 1878 President Hayes promptly vetoed it as being unwise financial

CARTOON FROM THE DETROIT
"NEWS"

7681

legislation, but it was passed over his veto, and I shall have no hesitancy in voting against its reënactment.

“The third proposition submitted is the free and unlimited coinage of silver upon a ratio of somewhere between 16 and 20 to 1. I have but a word to say in relation to this proposition. None of these ratios represents the commercial ratio. Coin your silver dollar in the ratio of 16 to 1 or 20 to 1 and you have a dollar intrinsically worth less than the gold dollar, and coin such a dollar as that—permit the owners of silver bullion to bring to the mints of the United States and have manufactured into dollars a certain number of grains, worth in bullion much less than when they are coined, is a proposition to which I cannot give my assent.

“But it has been stated in the course of this debate and repeatedly asserted that the present silver dollar is the ‘dollar of the fathers.’ That statement is not true. It is not the ‘dollar of the fathers,’ and the fathers if living would repudiate such an assumption as a reflection upon their integrity and sagacity. The silver dollar of the fathers was intended to be and was in fact exactly equal to the gold dollar in intrinsic value.

“When Hamilton and the men of his time were considering the establishment of the United States Mint, in 1792, the question presented was whether we

should coin silver or gold, or both, and having determined to utilize and coin both gold and silver, the only remaining question was just how much silver should be put in the silver dollar, and how much gold in the gold dollar. It was agreed on all hands there must be just such an amount put into the silver dollar and the gold dollar as would make them exactly equal in commercial value; for there was no man living at that time outside a mad house who entertained the idea that you could coin dollars of unequal intrinsic value and make them circulate side by side in any monetary system. For it is a law as old as monetary science, and as inexorable as the moving of the spheres, that if you have two dollars of unequal value the cheaper will be the only one that will circulate, and the more valuable will be driven out of circulation.

“Mr. Baring said upon this subject: ‘A very slight difference of one-tenth or one-quarter of one per cent. would determine the use of one metal or the other.’ Our own history demonstrates the truth of this law. Under the ratio of 1 to 15, established in 1792, the two coins separated in a few years, because it was found that the commercial value and the monetary value did not correspond, and gold went out of circulation, and our coined silver was the only money remaining in circulation. In 1834 the ratio was changed to 16 to 1, but it was soon discovered that

resham's
law

the commercial ratio did not then correspond with the monetary ratio, and the result was that silver was more valuable than gold, and went out of circulation, while gold became our only circulating metallic money. When the owner of $371\frac{1}{4}$ grains of pure silver could get more for that silver uncoined than he could by having it coined into a silver dollar, certainly he would not take it to the Mint of the United States to have its value lessened by being coined into money. So silver dollars went out of circulation.

“In 1861 we were flooded with a depreciated paper currency less valuable than either gold or silver, and the result was that it drove both gold and silver out of circulation, and they remained out of circulation until we resumed specie payments in 1879.

“This people have not forgotten the battle for the resumption of specie payments, and they do not care to repeat that experience. It was a long journey, fraught with hardship and disaster to many individuals, and had to be pursued in the face not only of Democratic opposition demanding the repeal of the Resumption Act and the continued non-payment of our unredeemed promises, but Parties sprang up in favor of fiat money and the wildest financial vagaries which, for the time being, threatened the credit and financial integrity of this Nation. Must we fight that battle over again? . . .

“We who favor the repeal of the Act of 1890 are the only real bimetallists, and we are pursuing the only course in my judgment by which bimetallism can be maintained. The free and unlimited coinage of silver at any of the ratios named will destroy bimetallism, and will reduce this country to a single standard, that of silver, and that depreciated, and I am suspicious that for this very reason some gentlemen are anxious for its triumph. The opening of the mints of the United States to the unrestricted minting for individuals of silver into legal dollars at any ratio to gold less than the commercial value of both metals, under the pretence of aiding the cause of bimetallism or for the purpose of establishing or maintaining bimetallism in the United States, is simply playing upon the sentiment and credulity of the American people. . . .

“Let the people but once understand that all this talk about bimetallism is simply a cover to hide the obnoxious fact that it is silver monometallism that is the real purpose, or at least the certain result, and they will have none of it. There is no considerable portion of our people who would vote to place this country on a silver basis. The argument between the advantages of the two systems is a real, living one. . . .

“At one time a practice prevailed in England of

clipping the coins and thereby depreciating their value. The English Government made that practice a felony punishable by death. Women were burned at the stake and men were dragged to the scaffold for clipping the coins of the realm. But it is now seriously proposed in the National House of Representatives of the American people to legalize an unlimited issue of debased currency. It is proposed that this great Government, which through all its perilous history of the last thirty years kept faith with all its creditors, and stands today with a credit matchless and unimpaired, shall now enter upon the shoreless and fathomless sea of depreciated coinage, whose only harbor is National repudiation and individual bankruptcy, to the utter destruction of the Nation's credit and the prosperity of the citizen."

Three days later the House repealed the Sherman Act, but the Senate delayed action until October 30, causing severe business depression throughout the country. When at last the Silver men surrendered, the expected relief did not come, owing to the fact that adverse trade conditions embarrassed the Treasury in its efforts to maintain the parity between gold and silver, and the Secretary was obliged to admit that the Treasury was spending beyond its income. The gold reserve had to be used not only for redemption but also for ordinary expenses. Secretary Carlisle

appealed to Congress for authority to sell bonds to supply the deficiency, but the Silver men blocked favorable action, demanding that the silver in the Treasury should be used with gold in redeeming the notes presented.

In January, 1894, bids were asked for \$50,000,000 five per cent. ten year bonds, to be purchased with gold, with the announcement that minimum offers must include a premium of over seventeen per cent.; but as the bonds were redeemable in "coin" and not specifically in gold, they did not prove especially attractive. They were at last disposed of, but as nearly half of the payments were made in gold withdrawn by the subscribers from the Treasury, the relief was only partial. By November the gold reserve had fallen so low that it became necessary to invite bids for a second \$50,000,000 bond issue, and the result was almost identical.

As these efforts to relieve the crisis had proved abortive, and the situation became more and more critical, President Cleveland called Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan to the White House in consultation. As a result, drastic action was taken, Congress being warned that unless an issue of gold interest-bearing bonds was immediately authorized an agreement would be entered into with private bankers for the purchase of gold. Congress did not act, and on Feb-

ruary 8, 1895, a contract was entered into with three important houses for the purchase of three and one-half million ounces of gold, payment to be made in bonds. An important clause in the contract stipulated that the lenders should use their influence to protect the Treasury against the withdrawals of gold, and the fact that this protection was accomplished was a striking tribute to Mr. Morgan's influence in the money markets of the world,—he was the Joshua, “at whose command the sun and moon stood still.” By the time this contract expired conditions had again become normal, and business had revived. When, a year later, President Cleveland was again obliged to ask for an additional loan of \$100,000,000, confidence was so far restored that bids received from public subscription covered the entire amount many times. When the elections of 1896 insured a return to a gold standard those who had hoarded gold again placed it in circulation, and the strain upon the Treasury was relieved.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED DATE
LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

ENTS
ETURN
NALTY
DURTH
1 DAY

MAR 13 1968 81

REC'D LD FEB 28 '68 -3PM

1937

1917

21

47

17

LD 21A-45m-9,'67
(H5067s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

FEB 1 1968
LD 21-20m-6,'32
DEAD

YC 51338

536707

E 664

B 9706

v. 1

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

